

MAR 1 '54

THE MONTH

*Index in last Vol.
V. 11 #2
Feb. 1954*

FEBRUARY 1954

THE TELEVISION DEBATE

A Point of View

LEON O'BROIN

PRISONERS OF TIME

K. M. BOOTH

THE 'ITALIANATE' ENGLISHMAN

H. E. G. ROPE

THE JESUITS IN NORTHERN BRAZIL

J. B. BURY

A NOTE ON GERARD HOPKINS

M. C. D'ARCY

REVIEWS

ROBERT HAMILTON, C. C. MARTINDALE,
HUMPHREY J. T. JOHNSON

New Series Vol. 11, No. 2

2s. 6d. net

VOL. CXCVII



No. 1038



Medieval Essays

By Christopher Dawson

16/- net

As Mr. Dawson explains in his Introduction, the Middle Ages have all too often been regarded as a kind of waiting-room between two periods of history. He is concerned in these essays to show how there came about that Medieval synthesis which was the characteristic achievement of the Middle Ages, and in what that synthesis consisted.

Particularly important are the two essays dealing with the "Christian East" and the "Moslem West", showing the influence of Islamic culture and ideas upon the development of Christendom.

Mr. Dawson looks at various aspects of Medieval life and thought, and in particular at the romantic tradition and the vernacular literatures that grew out of it.

Gerald Bullett spoke of it in a broadcast as "A book which no student of the Middle Ages can afford to ignore," and this applies especially to Catholics whose thought and culture descends so directly from that of the medievals.

(We remind you that we have recently yet again reprinted Mr. Dawson's classic, *The Making of Europe*, at 18/- net. The two books could well be read together.)

SHEED & WARD, LTD.

33 MAIDEN LANE, LONDON, W.C.2

A Layman's Love of Letters

The Clark Lectures for 1953

G. M. TREVELYAN, O.M.

The Clark Lectures, which may deal with any subject connected with English Literature, are provided each year by Trinity College for the University of Cambridge. For many years past they have been delivered by distinguished persons, usually as professional students or critics of literature. In 1953, however, Dr. Trevelyan has spoken from the point of view of a "layman": a layman, because he has never been a professional teacher or critic in the field of literature, but only a general reader. The variety of topics chosen gives ample scope to the range and versatility of the author's mind.

11s. 6d. net

Catherine the Great

and other Studies

C. P. GOOCH

The portrait of Catherine the Great in this book completes the author's trilogy on the Enlightened Autocrats, previous instalments having dealt with Frederick the Great and Maria Theresa.

21s. net

The Western Dilemma

ALAN GORDON SMITH

It is generally admitted that there are two distinct elements in Western culture, the Hellenic and the Christian. From the Christian there spring the traditional values—justice, respect for the human person and for the individual conscience. From the Hellenic tradition is derived rational argument and the mood of Socratic questioning and intellectual doubt. The dilemma with which the Western world is today faced is how these two elements can be reconciled and faith be based solidly on grounds of reason.

11s. 6d. net

LONGMANS

Cardinal Gasquet

A Memoir by SHANE LESLIE

"This is certainly the most original life of a highly placed ecclesiastic of our times that we can remember."—MICHAEL DE LA BEDOYERE in the *Catholic Herald*.

"This great ecclesiastic appears in these documents as a humorous, lovable and extremely broad-minded personality, one of the most important in the modern Roman Catholic revival."—MGR. H. FRANCIS DAVIS, in the *Birmingham Post*.
With frontispiece. 21s.

Mary in the Documents of the Church

PAUL F. PALMER, S.J.

"It is the most beautiful, most thrilling, most exciting, most prayer-compelling book on Our Lady that I have read for some years. It is at the same time the most factual, the best documented, for it is a brief compendium of the poetry, prayer and theology which is the teaching of the Church on the Mother of God. . . . A book for all devout Christians in Our Lady's Year."—*Catholic Herald*. 9s. 6d.

The Faith and Modern Man

ROMANO GUARDINI

This is a translation of the author's *Glaubenserkenntnis*. In his preface the author tells how the twelve essays united in this book were written during World War II, when the Christian life in Germany, and elsewhere, was deeply threatened by hostile doctrines. They grew "spontaneously out of the urgent questions asked by people in spiritual stress." 15s.

BURNS OATES

28 Ashley Place, S.W.1

THE MONTH

New Series

FEBRUARY 1954

VOL. II. No. 2

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE TELEVISION DEBATE: A POINT OF VIEW	<i>Leon O'Broin</i> 69
PRISONERS OF TIME	<i>K. M. Booth</i> 84
THE 'ITALIANATE' ENGLISHMAN	<i>H. E. G. Rope</i> 93
THE JESUITS IN NORTHERN BRAZIL	<i>J. B. Bury</i> 103
A NOTE ON GERARD HOPKINS	<i>M. C. D'Arcy</i> 113
REVIEWS	116

The Month is edited from 114 Mount Street, W.1, GROsvenor 2995, and published by Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd., 6 & 7 Clifford Street, London, W.1. Subscriptions may be addressed to any bookseller, or, in Great Britain, direct to the publishers; in U.S.A. to British Publications, Inc., 30 East 60th Street, New York 22, N.Y.; in France to W. H. Smith & Son, 248 Rue de Rivoli, Paris, 1. The annual subscription is 30s., U.S.A. \$5.

Bonnington Hotel

**A FRIENDLY WELCOME
and COURTEOUS SERVICE**

In R.A.C. and A.A. London
lists - Accommodation for
335 - Telephone and radio in
all bedrooms - Stock rooms
Conference rooms

**Room & Breakfast, from 22/6
With Private Bath, 31/-**

Central heating throughout
Licensed restaurant - A high
standard of food and cooking.
Situated in Holborn, con-
venient for City and West End

**SOUTHAMPTON ROW
W.C.1**

*Telephone: HOLborn 6525
Grams: Bonnington, Westcent, London*

Principles of Natural Theology

by

G. H. JOYCE, S.J.

*is now
available again*

21s. net



LONGMANS

SMALL ADVERTISEMENTS

BOURNEMOUTH. A Catholic Hotel, close Sacred Heart Church. Brochure on request. Beresford Court, Madeira Road. (Telephone, 1465.)

B. O. W. S. & BARTLETT, LTD. has been formed by Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. and Walker-Symondson, Ltd., the builders, to provide all requirements for church and school. Write for advice and estimates to Mr. Anthony Bartlett, General Manager, B. O. W. S. & Bartlett, Ltd., 25 Ashley Place, London, S.W.1. (Telephone TATe Gallery 8101.)

DAVID LOW, 17 Cecil Court, London, W.C.2. Catalogue of Second-hand Books (Number 112) free on request, also Special List, "Historical and Liturgical Theology." Out-of-print books really searched for—such requests really welcomed. Libraries, small collections, or single volumes bought at fair prices.

THE MONTH. Subscriptions may be taken out for a year (30/-) or six months (15/-). Greetings Card with your name will be enclosed in the first copy. Write to MANRESA PRESS, Roehampton Lane, S.W.15.

THOMAS BAKER, Bookseller, 85 Charlotte Street, London, W.1. Catholic Books—New and Second-hand supplied. Collections purchased.

TYPING AT HOME. Work accepted and completed with care and efficiency. Barbara Downs, Somerville, Wayside, Danbury, Chelmsford, Essex.

Charge for insertion of small advertisements, 5d. per word, minimum 5/-, prepaid.

THE TELEVISION DEBATE

A Point of View

By

LEON O'BROIN

AS A GUIDE to an understanding of what is involved in the introduction of commercial television into Great Britain it is useful to know what has been happening in its place of origin, the United States. A recent issue of *Impact*, the quarterly British journal of marketing, advertising and presentation, which contains a great deal of valuable information on this subject, places the inception of American television in July 1941. Five months later came Pearl Harbour and the entry of the United States into the war; at that time there were only six stations and 7,000 sets. When expansion was renewed at the end of hostilities development was extremely rapid as these figures from 1949 onwards show:

Year	Number of Stations	Homes receiving Television
1949	96	932,000
1950	106	3,950,000
1953	256 (April)	21,215,000 (January)

It is estimated that 330 stations will serve twenty-seven million homes in 1954.

Seventy-six per cent of television station ownership is vested in persons already owning radio or sound broadcasting stations. Newspapers comprise thirty-one per cent of television interests and radio manufacturers six per cent. There are four major networks but, as a check on monopolies, none of them is permitted by the Federal Communications Commission to own more than five stations. Coverage is obtained by linking up independently-owned stations.

On the basis of the January 1953 figures—already exceeded by

many millions—television was then reaching 45·7 per cent of all American homes and in the major market areas (New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Detroit, Cleveland and Boston) the percentage of homes with television varied between eighty-one and eighty-nine per cent. In these homes, the average time spent by the average viewer (men, women and children) is four and a half hours per day and there was no evidence so far of the “novelty” wearing off. Fewer evenings were spent away from home, cinema attendance was down, radio listening had fallen, magazine reading among women was waning, while newspaper reading was not affected to any extent. Of the effect on children, an UNESCO report, quoted by *Impact*, said that no significant differences in school achievement were observable as between televiewing and non-televiewing children, and that no solid evidence was available of the psychological influence of television on the young.

But if the “novelty” had not worn off, forty-six per cent of viewers were doing something else while watching television, either sewing, knitting, performing household chores, looking after the baby, or eating and drinking, and twenty-five per cent of viewers managed somehow to read at the same time. This capacity to do two things at once has apparently not impaired the value of television as an advertising medium: on the contrary *Impact* quotes a half-dozen out of hundreds of case histories to show how well television pays. In one case, a company made a special offer on television of a luxury product and, before the programme left the air, it had received enough telephone orders to pay for the cost of the programme.

The gross cost of programmes is mounting steadily in the United States. Higher payment is demanded for time as more homes link up with stations and as competition pushes up the value of performers, particularly of the best of them. In January 1949, when there were thirty-four stations, the average time cost was £3,500. In July 1952, when there were sixty-three stations, the corresponding figure was £19,200. For a one-hour show the average talent cost rose from £2,300 in 1948 to £9,500 in 1951. Because of these heavy charges there is a growing tendency for advertisers to have fortnightly instead of weekly shows. Nevertheless the number of users of television advertising increased from 236 in 1948 to 23,000 in 1950.

This enormous rate of expansion is producing equally enormous profits for everybody concerned. In the initial years, as one would expect, there were none. But from a source other than *Impact* I have gathered that in 1951 the corner was so well turned that a profit of forty-one million dollars was made out of a total revenue of 235 millions, compared with a profit of sixty-one million dollars in the old-established business of sound radio. Little wonder, therefore, that from 1950 to the end of 1953 the number of stations practically trebled although each of them cost approximately a half-million dollars to build, exclusive of studios.

These are the profits of the stations only. The advertisers of course also had their substantial whack, as well as the radio manufacturers who are disposing of receivers at the rate of more than 5,000,000 a year. All of this profit derives from the "monochrome" or black and white era, but with colour television in the offing, which to be received will require new sets or adaptors to old sets, and the possibility of other improvements thereafter, it is easy to see how well-off the people in the American television business are, and how rosy looks the future for them.

Television can, therefore, truly be described as a great and growing business in the United States. It is not yet the leading advertising medium, ranking third to newspapers and magazines, but its rate of increase is far in excess of other media. It was forty-one per cent higher in 1952 than in 1951 as against an overall increase in advertising generally of eleven per cent. Sound Radio, with 2,000 stations, has a much larger national coverage than television and is still largely used by United States advertisers in conjunction with television, but there is evidence that it loses ground when it comes into direct competition with television.

It is probably as a result of a natural enough feeling among business people that this is a desirable development to be associated with, helped no doubt by a genuine desire to see their country get a share of the world market, that the demand has arisen in Britain for commercial television as an alternative to the services of the B.B.C. Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, M.P., the solitary member of the Beveridge Commission of 1949 to recommend the abolition of the B.B.C. monopoly, did see that a break-up of the monopoly would, among other advantages, provide British trade and industry with a new facility, British advertising with new techniques which would be of great advantage in export

markets, and would give British entertainment business a new impetus leading to the earning of more foreign currency. In using these phrases Mr. Lloyd was re-echoing the submissions made to the Commission by the Institute of Incorporated Practitioners in Advertising which stressed the need for British competition "on reasonable terms in the vitally important entertainment industry which, through film and radio, has become a great international fact, and in which our present weakness is a national danger," and by Horlicks Ltd., Lever Brothers and Unilever Ltd., and Rowntree and Company, who averred that with radio (including television, of course) closed to the British industrialist, he was working "with one hand tied behind his back." This sort of talk, although it made no impression on Lord Beveridge and his committee, sounded convincing to the Conservative Government when it came to them with strong support from their own backbenchers. They were to declare later officially that "Competition at home should induce vitality and help Britain to produce programmes for overseas markets."

The Beveridge report in favour of the continuance of the B.B.C. monopoly was in keeping with the tradition of broadcasting in Britain which had first begun under commercial aegis and was then, coldly and deliberately and as a matter of preference after public enquiry and by formal act, handed over to the B.B.C. as a public utility. The Corporation was made a trustee of the national interest, was accorded the maximum freedom consonant with the over-riding power of Parliament, and was designed to be directed by Governors of judgment and independence who would inspire public confidence by having no other interests to promote than those of the public weal. Programmes were to be paid for by the sale of wireless licences, surplus revenue being retained by the State. This policy, the exact opposite of the American, was based on the recommendations of the Crawford Committee of 1925, and was reviewed ten years later by another public enquiry (the Ullswater Committee) which praised "the wisdom which founded the British Broadcasting Corporation in its present form" and recommended its continuance unchanged. The Charter was thus renewed for further periods totalling fifteen years and carried the Corporation through the war and the post-war reconstruction era.

The difference between British and American broadcasting has

always been clear-cut. One is a monopoly worked in the public interest, which pays no dividends to any person (the sums retained by the Exchequer and applied to the reduction of taxation enure to the benefit of the whole community); the other is a multiple affair operated for the benefit of those who have invested money in it and its utility to them is judged primarily by the return on the investment. In the preamble to the B.B.C. Charter "the great value of the Service as a means of information, education and entertainment" is commended and the royal will is expressed that it should continue so to be developed and exploited. A defender of the American system could argue that his service serves the same ends, but when programmes are compared we see how enormously inferior, with exceptions of course, the American productions are to those of the B.B.C.

In the United States the listener and viewer get substantially what they ask for because the whole radio industry is built up on that idea. If they be ignored, the profits wane. Hence nothing is more important than the assessment of listener reaction. In Britain, listening figures are not at all so important. They are carefully compiled but they have been used, one suspects, not to give the people precisely what they want but to see how far their wants can be fitted in with the triple B.B.C. Charter obligation of informing, educating and entertaining. The B.B.C., on a listener basis, for instance, are probably not justified in having a Third Programme and it could be argued that the standards of the other two programmes do not make sufficient concessions to the large numbers of licence-holders who tune in so frequently to commercial stations outside Britain. As an outsider, however, I must confess I have always regarded the B.B.C.'s behaviour in this regard as wholly praiseworthy. It is, in my view, an excellent use of a public trust, directed towards the elevation of public taste and has produced imitators in other countries, as well as contributing greatly to the prestige of Britain in the world of the arts and sciences. There is nothing at all comparable to this in America, and admissions to that effect can be obtained from within America itself.

I came recently across an article in the *New York Times Magazine* in which the writer, a Mr. Jack Gould, endeavoured to make an objective comparison between American and European television. What he had to say is most illuminating.

There's a big difference [he noted] between American and European television. In Europe all television is under Government auspices and is non-commercial. You never hear television or radio described as "an industry" as in the United States. In Britain and on the Continent broadcasting is regarded as an art, a form of theatre, and an informational and educational medium. Commerce and advertising do not enter the picture. . . . Where American video is the strongest and most spectacular, European and British video is sadly wanting. And where one's friends abroad shine, we are merely beginners.

The most striking shortcomings of foreign television, according to Mr. Gould, are lack of programme variety, lack of stations and lack of stars.

Money [he says] simply is not available to offer the best entertainment regularly. Complain as we may about abuses of sponsorship, there is no denying that it has brought into the American home practically all the headliners we have. Without the top professionals in show business, our television would wither away overnight.

Mr. Gould next remarks that television, without commercials, "seems like heaven come true," and that from the viewers' standpoint American television is much too commercial. He then adds that "one gets a different reaction after a sustained viewing of European television. An American begins to wish for a commercial to lend a bit of life to the evening," but Mr. Gould's reason for saying this, namely, that the American "can be particularly thankful for a time limitation where most comedians are concerned," indicates how lifeless he finds the American productions despite the emphasis on star performers and the unlimited finance which makes this possible. He continues: "In drama, on the other hand, having no commercials helps a lot. To see a play without having the mood rudely broken by a pitchman is so completely sensible that American viewers are foolish to put up with any other practice."

The last paragraphs of the article restate the American superiority in revues, variety shows and in financial resources, and then quite illogically, in the light of the admissions of Europe's superior achievements with monopoly control, ends by moralizing that "it is pretty dangerous when just one individual can decide what a whole country shall or shall not see on tele-

vision." Mr. Gould, however, appears at this point to be thinking politically; he is conscious of the drab propaganda of the Soviet-controlled stations in East Berlin and his mind is filled with fear that a similar unhappy fate may overwhelm the rest of us.

It should be explained that apart from the money-making approach to the "industry," what has led to the sort of programmes self-respecting Americans are not happy about is "sponsoring," the system whereby a multiplicity of advertisers operating on many stations prepare and produce programmes themselves with little or no advertence to what each other is doing, a limited effort at balance being made by the use of the "free time" the Federal Communications Commission's directions enjoin. The antithesis of that is the system practised in the B.B.C. whereby alternative programmes, constructed so as to satisfy various ranges of interest—low, middle and high, brows, if you like—are co-ordinated closely with each other. This technique is observable in its sound broadcasting programmes, and will no doubt become apparent likewise in television when the B.B.C. introduce the second programme the Director-General announced some time ago. This might have been in operation already were it not that, unlike the United States, television in Britain became involved in the rigorous control of capital expenditure which the Government, because of the impaired economic situation, found it necessary to impose. It was only in 1949, by which time, as we saw, there were nearly 1,000,000 homes in the United States receiving television, that a relaxation was granted and then the B.B.C. produced without delay a five-year-plan for the building of transmitters and studios. This synchronized with the Labour Government's decision to continue to charge the B.B.C. with responsibility for all broadcasting, including television. By 1952 the first stage of the plan was completed, with the erection of five high-power stations which brought seventy-eight per cent of the population within reliable reception range. The second part of the plan, with the erection of five further medium-power stations, will complete the national coverage. In the meantime the number of television homes had increased from 239,345 (1949) to 1,892,832 (1952), land had been purchased in London and the erection begun of a television headquarters and studio centre which, from my own observation, must rank among the largest and finest radio buildings in the world. This development is

being financed to a considerable extent out of Sound broadcasting revenue and more recently by borrowing, but as the licence fee is only £2 a year, and as the British Exchequer retains fifteen per cent of the total revenue and levies income tax on moneys placed to reserve, it is clear that, with Government agreement, the means are available to the Corporation of covering all foreseen expansion.

The B.B.C.'s own ideas were very seriously upset when in May 1952 the British Government announced its intention of providing the B.B.C. Television Service with a rival within its own territory, a rival which, it was assumed, would function by means of sponsored programmes. By this action, the Government broke with tradition, threw overboard the Beveridge majority Report and adopted the minority recommendation of Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, now a Minister of State, but in relation, however, to one side only of the B.B.C.'s activities. In strict logic it is difficult to understand why a distinction should have been made between Television and Sound Broadcasting. Mr. Lloyd had made no such distinction. He had recommended competition generally on the grounds that the B.B.C. was too big and unwieldy, tended towards complacency and rigidity thus hindering development, was the only employer of radio talent in the country, which he believed was a bad thing, and, most serious of all, exercised excessive power. These objections had been raised by many people concerned with broadcasting including, of course, persons with commercial and advertising interests, as well as Fabian and Liberal Research Groups and the Editor of *The Economist*. The difficulty was to find an alternative to "the brute force of monopoly." There were many suggestions. Finally, however, the Committee with the one dissident decided to continue the monopoly. Rather than try to have several different B.B.C.s it was better to have one, with adequate machinery for securing decentralization, for securing external criticisms and for opening the mind of the B.B.C. to argument. Monopoly, as Lord Beveridge himself has said, is not always an evil.

Criticisms of the monopoly relate to the period when the B.B.C. was promoting sound broadcasting almost exclusively, yet are not being used to curb the B.B.C. in that field, but in the field of television where achievement has been drastically limited as a result of Government action. It is, however, not absolutely certain that the Conservatives have closed their minds

to the possibility of competitive sound broadcasting sooner or later. In their first White Paper on Broadcasting Policy issued in May 1952, they paid tribute to "the excellent and reputable Broadcasting Service" developed under the B.B.C. monopoly. They declared that the Corporation's services must remain intact and that the Corporation should be the only broadcasting organization having any claim on the revenue from receiving licences. They also indicated their unwillingness to see any change in the policy of the B.B.C. itself towards sponsoring or accepting advertisements. But, in the upshot, they proposed to renew the Charter again for a limited period and the Lord Chancellor, speaking in the House of Lords some time ago, expressed the personal hope that sponsored television would lead to sponsored radio. The Corporation's monopoly over sound broadcasting will, therefore, become again in a few years the subject of public enquiry, but long before that the anomaly of competition in one sphere and not in another will draw attention to itself.

The announcement about competitive television produced, as everybody knows, a remarkable debate on platforms and in the press, one of the really great discussions of our time. Interested persons formed themselves into organizations for or against, those for including persons who wanted to end the B.B.C. monopoly for cultural and other purposes, and persons directly or indirectly interested in the commercial exploitation of the medium. The matter became highly political, too; this was inevitable once the Government of the day had stated its intention of reversing the policy of the Labour Government and the Labour Party had retaliated by declaring its intention of restoring the position once they were again in power. The matter was advanced a further step last November when the Government released a second White Paper, modifying to some extent their earlier proposals, but leaving the position not essentially different so far as the B.B.C. is concerned. The Government's policy was summarized by the Postmaster-General (Earl De La Warr) as containing four principles, *viz.*:

- (1) that the alternative television programme must be provided by minds other than those of the B.B.C., which means that it must be provided by private enterprise and paid for by advertisements;

- (2) that the new programme will be alternative to and not a substitute for an existing programme, which means that the B.B.C. is to continue in its present form;
- (3) that a new public corporation will control the alternative television enterprise, will own and operate the transmitting stations, and will be responsible for maintaining the standard of the programmes. This body will hire its facilities or enter into contracts with privately financed companies which will provide programmes and draw revenue from advertisements. If, as may happen, different companies operate a particular station, it will be for the new corporation to ensure the proper planning and balance of programmes on that station;
- (4) that there will be no "sponsoring." This means that programme-makers will hire time to advertisers, either for short advertisements, commonly known as "spot," or else documentaries. At all times there will be a clear line of distinction between what is presented as programme and as advertisement, and programme-makers, and not the advertisers, will be solely responsible for their programmes at all times. Interruption of programmes for the purposes of advertisements will not be permitted.

The first thing to note about the Postmaster-General's summary of policy is that the Government have been at pains to find a substitute for the American system of "sponsoring." Like most Europeans they find little to commend in American programmes; they believe that better standards will be achieved in Britain by taking the preparation of the programmes out of the hands of advertisers and putting it in the hands of the programme companies. Moreover they believe that the British advertiser is a different sort of animal from the American.¹ But this decision and these beliefs leave the objective of the B.B.C.'s rival unchanged, which is to make profits. If other goals can simultaneously be realized no doubt there are British business men who would like to reach them. But can they? Is not there a danger that

¹ "Above all let us remember another great distinction affecting the British and the American systems. That is the difference between the mentality of British advertisers and the mentality of American advertisers, and the difference between British and American taste. I am not saying that one is better than the other; I am saying merely that they are different. I believe that that is an imponderable which may well be the most important difference of all."—Earl De La Warr.

something will happen akin to what has occurred in the field of journalism where many newspapers and magazines play down to the millions and thereby secure enormous sales? This is denied, of course, by the defenders of competitive television.

It is theoretically true that programmes produced by stations, overseen by a corporation interested in standards and balance, should be better than the advertisers' own productions, but if the stations and the corporation go too far to achieve standards they will be brought to heel by the advertisers. Those who pay the piper will call the tune. At that point commercial television could come to a standstill and its continuance depend upon either the willingness of the Exchequer to subsidize it or upon a surrender of principle to the advertisers. What is more likely to happen is that the commercial television stations will, as in the United States, put on as many light vaudeville shows as possible and thereby draw maximum audiences to themselves and away from the B.B.C. They will thereby put themselves into a position in which political parties will be afraid to assail them. In Australia, where Radio is organized broadly on the lines envisaged for British television, the national body corresponding to the B.B.C. is listened to by twenty per cent to thirty per cent of the people, the commercial stations by seventy per cent to eighty per cent.

Competition is bound to affect the B.B.C. adversely. Every new station set up will automatically draw viewers away from them. If they maintain their present programme policy, in the face of an endless round of music-hall entertainment, the slump in viewing figures is bound to be dramatic. If they pay too much attention to minority interests they might end by having only a minority to look after. But it would appear that the B.B.C. have no intention of catering for a minority only. Its Director General, Sir Ian Jacob, in a recent press conference said:

If we are going to have competition, it will be two-way competition. They will be competing with us, but we shall also be competing with them. Anyone who thinks competitive television will make no difference to the B.B.C. is very wrong. If, say, the B.B.C. is putting on "Ballet for Beginners" and a commercial station offers, at the same time, a "popular" programme—well, "Ballet for Beginners" might have to go out of the window.

This is a gloomy prospect when one considers the undoubted value of the "less popular" items in the B.B.C.'s programmes.

But Sir Ian Jacob's attitude, while regrettable, is understandable. No concern likes to lose customers to a rival, especially to a newcomer giving something away ostensibly for nothing (although this, of course, is untrue—every purchaser of advertised goods or services will pay for the television show). And no taunt will be more common if commercial television becomes a fact and B.B.C. policy remains unchanged than that the B.B.C. are putting on shows that plain John Citizen pays for but does not look at.

The second matter that comes to mind as a result of the Postmaster-General's statement is that the Government will appoint the governors or directors of the new corporation as well as those of the B.B.C. It must surely be unique for the Executive to nominate and perhaps in time to interchange the Directors of two competitive organizations. And it is not unfair, I hope, to suggest that in reducing the power of the B.B.C., the Government is increasing their own.

The summary of policy we have been looking at was made by the Postmaster-General in a speech during a House of Lords' debate on a motion recognizing the desirability of an alternative Television Programme, but disapproving the Government's proposals. The discussion added little save elucidation to the arguments for and against competition. The Postmaster-General, who opened for the Government, did, however, undertake to consider very seriously everything said before legislation was laid before Parliament, and the Marquess of Salisbury, concluding for the Government, repeated that, within the broad basic principles of their scheme, they were ready to consider any suggestions that might be made. He referred particularly to the speeches of the Archbishop of Canterbury and Lord Waverley, the President of the National Television Council, which, he said, contained the germ of ideas which were certainly worthy of further study.

The Archbishop of Canterbury had said, in the course of his remarks, that the White Paper proposals of two independent systems, one financed by licence fees and the other financed by selling time to adventurers, seemed to him an astonishingly unbalanced proposal.

The viewer pays his fee to the B.B.C. and then gets a rival project "thrown in" for nothing. The more popular the system for which he does not pay becomes, the wealthier it will become, and therefore

the more the viewer would have to pay for the less popular system that he does not want to use so much, in order that it may have enough money to compete with the more popular system.

The Archbishop went on to propose that both the B.B.C. and the companies should draw their revenue from one and the same pool of licence fees. The pool would be divided "in agreed proportions." If the licence fee for such a double programme had to be raised to "the terrible sum of £5 per annum" it would be a trivial expense for each family compared with the average family's expenditure on smoking. He moved on then to a second proposition. He did not want advertisements at all, but if advertisements had to come, let them be permitted on both systems. "If, as we are told, advertisements can be strictly confined to a matter of a few minutes between programmes, the damage would not be all that serious."

Viscount Waverley took the same line:

... by all means have competitive programmes . . . but not substantially dependent on advertisements. I should not object to allowing some advertisements, experimentally or tentatively, though I think if that were done for the one Corporation the B.B.C. ought also to come into line.

None of these suggestions was really new. As we saw already, they or something very like them were submitted to the Beveridge Committee and rejected. Whether their adumbration at so late a stage and under such high patronage would lead to further modification of the Government's plan increased the interest in what the Government would have to say when their proposals were submitted for approval to the House of Commons. It was manifest that the B.B.C. would find no comfort in them. The alternative programme they prefer is naturally one worked by themselves, and they probably were more embarrassed than anything else by the attention the Government paid to the speeches of the Archbishop of Canterbury and Viscount Waverley. The B.B.C. could not be expected to take kindly to an arrangement under which they would share licence revenue with a second corporation. They would find it equally unattractive, and a severe break with their tradition, if they were obliged themselves to engage in a certain amount of commercial television. On the other hand, the ending of the B.B.C. monopoly and the intro-

duction of commercialism were such basic factors in the Government's position at the time of the House of Lords' debate that it appeared impossible for them to compromise on any scheme which omitted them no matter how much they might feel inclined to conciliate the large volume of opposition to their policy which had arisen in influential circles and among their own supporters.

When the subject came before the House of Commons the Government lost no time in making it clear that they were unable to accept the proposals that had interested them in the Lords' debate. To the suggestion that the second corporation should be financed by licence fees in the same way as the B.B.C. there were, they said, two great objections; first, all viewers would have to pay for a second programme which some might not want and which in some parts of the country they could not get, and second, it would mean so high a licence fee that evasions would certainly increase. This would probably mean taking increased powers for detecting evasion and some thousands of enforcement officers. The idea that the new corporation and the B.B.C. should share the licence fee and should both be allowed to take advertisements was rejected by the Government because they felt it would alter the whole basis of their policy, which was to leave the public to enjoy the B.B.C. exactly as it was, but to offer an alternative programme provided on a different basis.

The Government, it was stated, had given careful consideration to "every conceivable variety of scheme," but apart from those emanating from the Archbishop of Canterbury and Viscount Waverley they actually only mentioned two others, *viz.*, the provision of the second programme by the B.B.C.—this "had the insuperable objection that it was not ending the B.B.C. monopoly"—and "a scheme favoured by some Conservatives which provided for full-blooded private enterprise entirely dependent on advertisements and without any public corporation to supervise the programmes." This was rejected on the technical ground that the insufficiency of channels dictated that there could not be unrestricted free enterprise, and for the further reason that it was the Government's decision to proceed with caution. The present scheme, however, did not prejudice other developments.

Two days' debating failed to modify the Government's atti-

tude, but it did reveal a possible change in the position of Labour. Mr. Gammans, the Assistant Postmaster-General, who had indicated that the Government was still open to consider suggestions that "accepted the principle of ending the B.B.C. monopoly and would face the practical difficulties of doing so," referred to the declaration of the leader of the Labour Party to reverse the Conservatives' proposal when they returned to office and suggested that "Vote Labour and lose your second programme" would not be a particularly attractive slogan at the next General Election. This drew from Mr. Morrison later the statement that when Mr. Attlee had spoken as he did, the Government's policy was to have sponsoring and the Lord Chancellor had urged it not only for television but for sound broadcasting as well. He did not know what Mr. Attlee's reaction to the present scheme would be, but the Opposition were glad that the Government were prepared to consider further proposals provided the competitive principle was retained. Notwithstanding these words, an effort to bring about a round table discussion of possible alternatives made during the course of the debate failed, and the Government's proposals were finally carried by a vote of the House.

There the matter most uneasily rests. The Parliamentary discussions have, if anything, worsened the position of the B.B.C. inasmuch as they have strengthened the Government's resolve to stand firm on both the monopoly issue and on the introduction of the commercial or advertising element. A compromise solution now appears most unlikely. Nevertheless, while the draughtsmen are busy preparing the Bill to legalize the new corporation and the licence embodying the detailed conditions under which it will function, it is certain that strenuous efforts will be made to protect the position of the B.B.C. One possibility is that that body may be authorized to have a second programme, commercial in character, which would be its combative arm, offensive and defensive, offensive in competing with the rival corporation for advertising business, defensive in that it would preserve intact the traditional policy of the B.B.C. in relation to its primary programme. If this occurs, it will of course double the volume of advertising matter on the bands and this, for many people, will be the hardest dose to swallow.

PRISONERS OF TIME¹

By

K. M. BOOTH

IN HIS MONUMENTAL WORK, *A Study of History*, Professor Toynbee suggested that historians were prisoners of time. He courteously deprecated the activities of the "laboratory" historian who industriously accumulates arid data to prove or to discuss almost meaningless hypotheses. Many would agree with him. M. Léon Bloy spoke of industrious pedants of the *École des Chartes* engaged in tearing great historical traditions to pieces. In a recent article² M. Gabriel Marcel wrote: "The idea of spiritual heritage loses its meaning as history degenerates into mere accumulated documentation. By becoming 'document instead of memory,' history loses all sense of value and all real contact with the past." We do grow weary of such theses as: "A criticism of eighteenth-century criticism of sixteenth-century Portuguese drama."³ The specialist tends to forget the force of the irrational in history. It is well to bear in mind, for instance, the speech of the Mongol nobles when they chose Jenghiz Khan to be their leader: "We want you to be Khan. If you become Khan, we shall always be foremost in the fight against the foe, and when we take pretty women and girls prisoner, we shall bring them and the best of the loot to you."⁴ Often the names in a historical monograph are little more than impersonal symbols.

The specialist has adopted a "scientific" method, or, as Professor Toynbee says, adopted the principle of the division of labour. He has become a prisoner of the mentality of his own age. While his scientific method enables him to avoid the pathetic fallacy it leads him into another trap, the "apathetic" fallacy. Human beings cease to be human, becoming specimens in a historical laboratory.

¹ *A Study of History*, by Arnold J. Toynbee. Also *The World and the West*, by Arnold J. Toynbee (Oxford University Press, 1953, 7s 6d).

² *The Concept of Spiritual Heritage* (Confluence, September 1953, pp. 3 sqq.).

³ *The Times Literary Supplement*, 6 September 1947.

⁴ *The Mongol Empire*, by M. Prawdin, p. 50.

This criticism of the specialist seems to be reasonable. If historians sought only cautious scientific certainty they would kill Clio. But more humane historians, the writers of national histories, also incur Professor Toynbee's courteous condemnation. Rightly he asserts that the history of England is unintelligible unless we understand the Reformation and the Renaissance; and that demands an understanding of medieval Christendom, which links our modern world to Greece and Rome. Yet until recent years most countries insisted on teaching their young citizens a self-glorifying version of national history. The ugly nationalism of the nineteenth century was, unfortunately, contemporaneous with a great development of historical studies; and historians again found themselves prisoners of time.

After 1918, however, liberal internationalism found its expression in the League of Nations. Professor Toynbee seems to admit that this may have coloured his own outlook when he embarked on his courageous attempt to relate "the whole of universal history to certain philosophical principles which can be deduced from the facts"; but he did hope to secure objectivity. His attempt was and is courageous; the failure of his predecessors has not deterred him. If he were to succeed he would deserve the gratitude of mankind.

Wordsworth wrote:

There was a time when meadow, grove, and stream
The earth, and every common sight,
To me did seem
Apparell'd in celestial light,
The glory and the freshness of a dream.
It is not now as it hath been of yore;—

The things which I have seen I now can see no more.

Men hunger for the restoration of this freshness of vision whose loss the poet deplores; and, undoubtedly, history can be one of the elements which dull our minds. We do not mean the history of the textbooks but tradition and the surviving effects of the thoughts and deeds of our ancestors. The language the child speaks, the songs he sings, the tales he hears, the traditions of love and hatred, all these instilled into his defenceless mind are not of his choosing. No doubt he benefits; he has not to discover fire; he will not enjoy the ecstasy of seeing the first wheels roll;

instead of labouring to articulate his thoughts he may speak the language of Shakespeare and Racine. But the language and traditions of his people will, unless he is very fortunate, create the parochial mind which is one of the devil's favourite weapons. We often pay a very heavy price for our cultural heritage. Were Professor Toynbee to succeed his philosophy might bring light to man's darkened mind.

His main work, *A Study of History*, will be completed this year; but in the Reith Lectures he has given us some of the conclusions of his final volumes; and, it must be said at once, these conclusions are unconvincing. In the light of the historical knowledge we possess some of his assumptions seem to be false. Two of these assumptions may be characterized as the innocent Russia, and the terrible Turk.

Professor Toynbee wants, reasonably enough, to remind his readers that the West has been guilty of aggression against Russia. "It was not until 1945 that Russia recaptured the last piece of these huge Russian territories that were taken from her by Western Powers in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries." And he suggests that the threat from the West has been constant from the thirteenth century till 1945. This seems to be untrue. In *A Study of History* he wrote: "In the seventeenth century Russia experienced for the first time in her history a formidable pressure from the Western World." That is probably a slip; but he must know that from the time of Frederick the Great, at least, European statesmen feared Russia. Pitt dreaded the rise of her formidable power; alliance with Russia was the keystone of Bismarck's policy. After the Napoleonic wars the dread of Russia's intentions was general; and rightly, for, at the Treaty of Vienna, Russia had insisted on acquiring a large section of Prussian Poland, a land she had never occupied in the course of her history and one well within the borders of Western Christendom. It is not, I hope, unfair to criticize him for this and I am not impudently suggesting he is ignorant of these facts. No; but even in a few short pages written for informed readers he could surely have refrained from laying the whole burden of guilt on the West. It is, I suggest, even misleading to speak of Russia in the thirteenth century. There was more than one Russian State; and the ordinary histories of Russia give the impression that the Moscow princes, abjectly servile to the Tartars, won

power by murderous wars with their neighbours. Yet Professor Toynbee speaks of the Russian people submitting to the iron yoke of Moscow because of pressure from the West. The words "Russian people" are, perhaps, an example of that imprisonment in time with which he reproached other historians: the Russian people had not heard of Rousseau and nineteenth-century nationalism.

Of the Turks he writes: "the Western counter-attack on the Islamic world, which, after the Turks' failure at Vienna in 1683, was bound to come sooner or later, was delayed by long Western memories of the Turks' and other Muslim peoples' historic military prowess." This is the fallacy of the terrible Turk. The Turks were and are brave fighters; but in the nineteenth century their Government was rotten with corruption. Even then they were, as the siege of Plevna shows, hard to defeat. Nevertheless, a more reasonable generalization would be that jealousy among the European Powers was a far more potent factor than fear in the salvation of Turkey. Twice Russia had Constantinople within her grasp and each time the other Powers forced her to withdraw. Also it might be said that England's Indian empire, with its multitude of Muslim subjects, saved Turkey from destruction until her rulers allied themselves with the losing side in the war of 1914-18. Professor Toynbee wishes to show that the Turks were forced to adopt Western technique to save themselves. His argument along this line is, it seems, correct; but it seems unnecessary to stress the preservative power of the West's memory of Turkish military prowess. One of the chief reasons for delay seems to have been Western disunion.

The Christian West has always tended to be disunited politically and the Christian doctrine of the brotherhood of man, at best, only mitigated the conflicts of medieval Christendom. Since then nationalism has separated the peoples of the West still more. It is, perhaps, right to deplore the spread of nationalism among the Islamic Powers; but the remark that "the Islamic tradition of the brotherhood of man would seem to be a better ideal for meeting the social needs of the times than the Western tradition of sovereign independence" is very startling. Is the Muslim ideal any better or any worse than the Christian? The Muslims have, perhaps, a rather worse record for internecine religious war than the Christians. Only under the Umayyah

Caliphs were the political and religious worlds of Islam identical; and the Muslims should, according to their prophet, conquer the world by force. The Muslim ideal of the brotherhood of man is a more salutary doctrine than Western nationalism; its appeal is far less effective. Professor Toynbee's remark seems to be merely academic. A mental review of Islamic history gives the lie to the idea of any effective political strength in the "traditional Islamic feeling for unity."

There are times when the reader of the Reith Lectures is made disturbingly aware that Machiavelli, the Machiavelli of *The Prince*, has a far better grasp of the forces which make history than Professor Toynbee. His categories, if they are categories, of the forces which move men are uncomfortably convincing. His amoral recommendation of greed, self-interest, hypocrisy, good timing, etc., as the weapons of the successful statesman are uncomfortably near the truth; and to make out a case for saying that the success of a civilization depends on their correct use would not be too difficult. The Soviet Union is making good use of them to-day.

"For a smaller mind to make light of a greater is always presumptuous and in bad taste." Thus Professor Toynbee writes when introducing his criticism of Freeman; and that is my own feeling when criticizing the Reith Lectures; but it is impossible to avoid wondering if they would have been published at all had not *A Study of History* preceded them and earned the author a well-deserved reputation for wide learning and a power of masterly exposition. Their weaknesses are obvious and their virtues not particularly outstanding. Their author is no determinist; he conceives it to be possible for Western civilization to save itself; to remind his readers that though men of other cultures have been forced to adopt Western technique they dislike Westerners was useful; his suggestion that a technology is an integral part of a culture is stimulating; his further suggestion that the adoption of a foreign technique will necessarily undermine the culture that adopts it is also stimulating but even less convincing. Western technique had little effect on the Japanese mentality. At the end he suggests that salvation may come from a religious revival; but his final words are: "We cannot say, since we cannot foretell the future. We can only see that something which has actually happened once, in another episode of history,

must at least be one of the possibilities that lie ahead of us." *Parturiunt montes. . . .*

No, the Reith Lectures, stimulating though they are, do not seem to free man from the prison of history. Rather, taken together with the parts of *A Study of History* which have already appeared they seem to make his lot worse. The lectures put the poor reader in a context of four hundred years of time, hundreds of millions of men, and the whole globe. In the larger work he argues that all known civilizations are to all intents and purposes contemporaneous; for the history of civilizations covers 6,000 years of the 300,000 man is said to have lived on earth. Hence they cover less than 2 per cent of the span of human history. This proves what Professor Toynbee calls "The philosophical contemporaneity of all representatives of the species." Granted; but it is not an inspiring thought. Against the writer's will his vast perspectives are on a par with the work of scientists who stress astronomical space, geological time, the fecundity of the cod-fish and the insignificance of the individual. Or again the reader is irresistibly reminded of Bradley's famous phrase: "The sensuous curtain is a deception and a cheat, if it hides some colourless movement of atoms, some spectral woof of impalpable abstractions, or unearthly ballet of bloodless categories." This is true of all philosophers of history. In a generous effort to enlighten their fellow-men they create a ballet of bloodless categories; and in the play they make their puppets skip and dance to a tune of their own making. Then they leave poor mankind acting an unfinished play whose end the authors do not know.

Unlike more optimistic philosophers of history, Professor Toynbee does not attempt prophecy. He does not involve man in a dialectic, bound to end, some time, in the withering away of the State and the appearance of a classless society. His doctrine would bring more comfort if it did; determinism has a psychological attraction; and on their devotees predestinarian creeds bestow a self-confident exaltation. No, he expressly avoids the trap into which philosophers who dogmatize about an unfinished process fall. He knows that fully to understand the present, if there is a unity of history, one must live in the future; but he is content to attempt to discover laws which work effectively in given conditions. The underlying greatness of Professor Toynbee's conception lies not in his vast learning, nor in the rather suspect

facility with which he deduces his laws from insufficient data, as he himself admits, but in this, that he does not despair of man; he believes in freedom, believes man can conquer the world.

Whether his work when completed will prove his case we cannot say; but would that all philosophers of history would bear in mind the words of Burckhardt: "We shall not . . . lay any claim to historical principles. . . . We are not privy to the purposes of eternal wisdom; they are beyond our ken."

Even supposing Mr. Toynbee were to reach his ideal and attain laws of history the fact that he professes the freedom of man will not free man from the prison of time. It is difficult to see how his philosophy is going to combat the despair which overtakes so many. A hatred of the past is not uncommon. The philosophers of the eighteenth century despised the achievements of medieval Christendom. True, the Romantics delighted in the dream-world they called medieval; but it should be remembered that Bentham was their contemporary. His doctrines have never really died. M. Gabriel Marcel tells the story of a young American officer who congratulated the inhabitants of a European town on its destruction; they would, said the officer, be able to rebuild it with all modern improvements. To many the two world wars are the fruit of the sins of their ancestors. They feel the need to build a brave new world; and therefore many, knowing, as they think, that they cannot escape from the forces of time embrace Marxism, which claims to rationalize the historical process. A Marxian can claim to understand the modern world, and the world which is to come. Marxian criticism of the defects of the free world is often justified. This combination of intellectual certainty and the appeal to man's desire for justice, together with its promise of inevitable victory, is its strength. Many Western men are weary of the feeble, sceptical liberalism which served well enough when the world was prosperous.

Like Professor Toynbee, the Marxists exalt universal history; but the specialist destroys the Marxian claim. Recently the Soviet Government has insisted on teaching its youthful citizens that the Russian State began in the sixth century. They must convince their youth that Russia is one of the older members of the comity of nations. Most historians, even pre-Soviet Russian historians, held that the Russian State began in the eighth century. Have Soviet historians made a new discovery? Briefly the evidence

for the existence of this State, Volynia, is this. There are three chronicle references to it. One, in Procopius, is contemporary and very vague; the others belong to the tenth and twelfth centuries, and it is by no means certain they refer to Volynia; the Soviet historians admit that the archaeological evidence is insufficient; they have to fall back on the argument that linguistic unity is equivalent to political unity. The linguistic unity of the possibly existing sixth-century Volynians is itself an unproved hypothesis. Of course, according to Engels's philosophy something like this Volynia must have existed. Therefore it did exist.¹ "A posse ad esse valet illatio" is the most frequent fallacy of the philosophers of history. Professor Toynbee is far removed from this arrogant dogmatism; but there seem to be instances when the facts are "gentled" into fitting his theory. Dom Gougau, the expert on Celtic Christianity, did not accept the sharp distinction Professor Toynbee makes between Celtic and Roman Christianity.

Judgment on *A Study of History*, however, must be reserved until the whole work has appeared. If, however, philosophies of history usually crumble into dust at the touch of the specialist, and if the specialist is a prisoner of time, is history a meaningless concatenation of unique events?

On the rational or humanist level it seems that history may either dim our mental vision or enlarge it. We may escape from the pressure of the present, created by the past, by journeys into the past. When we return we can see the present with new vision. This approach is indicated by the words of Sophocles:

Many the things that strange and wondrous are,
None stranger and more wonderful than man;

He dares to wander far,
With stormy blast across the hoary sea
Where nought his eyes can scan
But waves still surging round unceasingly;

.

And speech and subtle thought
Swift as the wind,
And temper duly wrought
To statesman's mind,—

¹ *Speculum*, April 1953, pp. 324 sqq.

These has he learnt, and how to flee the power
Of cold that none may bear,
And all the tempest darts of arrowy shower,
That hurtle through the air;
Armed at all points, unarmed he nought shall meet
That coming time reveals;
Only from death still finds he no retreat,
Though many a sore disease that hopeless seemed he heals.

Contemplation of civilizations very different from our own may liberate us from parochialism of mind; and the more vividly we attempt to reconstruct man's activities the more deeply do we appreciate the mystery of man. There may be a philosophy implicit in this approach; but it seems best to accept this natural curiosity, which many have, as a fact. A few men unite this curiosity with poetic insight. They are the great historians; and Professor Toynbee, however much we may suspect his philosophy, often shows amazing insight.

The humanist approach, as expressed in the verses of Sophocles, does leave us with a sense of the abiding mystery of man. That, too, may cast us down. Even Newman, deeply religious as he was, felt this:

To consider the world in its length and breadth, its various history, the many races of man, their starts, their fortunes, their mutual alienation, their conflicts; and then their ways, habits and governments, forms of worship, their enterprises, their aimless courses, their random achievements and acquirements, the impotent conclusion of long-standing facts, the tokens so faint and broken of a superintending design . . . the success of evil, physical pain, mental anguish . . . all this is a vision to dizzy and appal; and inflicts upon the mind a sense of profound mystery, which is absolutely beyond human solution.

This is a religious, not philosophical approach; and, it seems, Newman goes too far. To faith, the power of entering into the mind of Christ and seeing the world to some extent as He would have us see it, the action of providence is manifest again and again in the story of the Church. And the religious vision of man's story does enable him to free himself from the prison of time. The paradox of Christianity is this. It is the most historical of religions; the Jews are prepared for the coming of the Incarnate God; God enters into history and, through Christ and His

Church, God works to bring men into union with Himself. The providential significance of particular events we do not see, usually; God's ways are not our ways; but we do know that seemingly disparate events work together for the fulfilment of God's purpose. On the other hand, through Christ, men are united to the Godhead and can transcend the prison of time. Without Christ, Clio tends to be a tragic muse; but in Christ the temporal and eternal are reconciled. His love has made men free.

THE 'ITALIANATE' ENGLISHMAN

By

H. E. G. ROPE

ROGER ASCHAM (1515-1568) was a man of some mark in English letters; remembered for his *Toxophilus* (1545) in praise of archery, and his *Scholemaster*. Of an old Yorkshire family, he was born near Northallerton, educated privately until he went to St. John's, Cambridge, in 1530; held sundry tutorial and diplomatic posts, and was much on the Continent before 1553. Renowned for his finished Latinity and classical scholarship, at the end of Edward VI's reign he was appointed Latin secretary to the king. From his Cambridge days he was a favourer of Protestantism; but it is not clear what was the occasion of his abandoning the Catholic faith. Here I propose to examine the Italian proverb he passed current in England in the *Scholemaster*, which his widow had published posthumously in 1570:

Inglese italianato e un diavolo incarnato.

The Italian proverb was older than the sixteenth century, and referred not to readers of Italian literature, Boccaccio and the rest, but to those English marauders and mercenaries, *condottieri*

and the like, who in the fourteenth century had acquired an exceedingly bad name for cruelty and outrage in France and Italy. In Italian eyes men like Sir John Hawkwood had far from romantic associations.¹

There is a sentence of Ascham's *Scholemaster* often quoted in praise of his moral and patriotic zeal

If you thinke, we iudge amisse, and write to² sore against you, heare, what the Italian sayth of the English Man, what the master reporteth of the scholer; who vttereth playnlie, what is taught by him, and what learned by you, saying, *Englese Italianato, e un diavolo incarnato*, that is to say, you remaine men in shape and facion, but becum deuils in life and condition. This is not the opinion of one, for some priuate spite, but the common iudgement of all, in a common Prouerbe, which riseth of that learnyng, and these maners, which you gather in Italie.³

(Be it said in passing, *Inglese* and *diavolo* would be more likely on Italian lips.) If the passage ended there it might well pass for a spirited protest against that aping of outland manners to which young travellers are sometimes given. What follows, however, points to a very different motive.

If some yet do not well understand, what is an English man Italianated, I will plainlie tell him. He, that by liuing, and traueling in Italie, bringeth home into England out of Italie, the Religion, the learning, the policie, the experience, the maners of Italie. That is to say for Religion, Papistrie or worse.⁴

This, then, is the very head and front of his offending, return to the old religion, which Ascham and his friends were trying to destroy at home. *Hinc illae lachrimae*. But what could be worse in Ascham's eyes than Papistry for religion? Atheism? Well, where was this to be found in England unless among the high Cecilian circle in whom his hopes were planted? Giordano Bruno's visit to England, Marlowe, Raleigh, Sidney, and their group were as yet below the horizon. The *Scholemaster* was dedicated to Cecil by Ascham's widow in 1570, two years after the writer's death.

A popular Italian proverb assuredly would not be aimed at

¹ See *Giovanni Acuto*, by G. Temple-Leader and G. Marcotti, Florence, 1889, ii. 13 and footnote. In Italian. (*Acuto* is Hawkwood in Italian guise.)

² too.

³ Ed. Arber, 1870, p. 78.

⁴ *Ibid.*

English converts to the Faith they had so lately let go. Indeed these found a welcome in Italy. It would seem, then, that Ascham and the proverb he quotes did not aim at the same mark. It will hardly be denied that the latter bore rather upon such examples of perfidious greed, cruelty and godlessness as Thomas Cromwell, whom Foxe had the effrontery to call "this valiant captain and soldier of Christ," who also from the scaffold urged his hearers to return to the old religion. Cromwell's mantle had fallen upon William Cecil and Nicholas Bacon, disciples who far outwent their Florentine teacher Niccolo Machiavelli (by traditional England associated with Old Nick). With these assuredly Ascham had no quarrel; indeed he held them in honour.

English youths return from Italy, Ascham complains, only to bring home

for learning, less commonly than they carried out with them; for policy, a factious heart, a discoursing head, a mind to meddle in all men's matters; for experience, plenty of new mischiefs never known in England before; for manners, variety of vanities and change of filthy living.

For the destruction of learning and ruin of morality that in fact accompanied the Reformation in England we have a cloud of witnesses, largely anti-Catholic, Bale, Latimer, Lever and Jewel among them. What quarrel, we may well ask, had Ascham with these? They were his colleagues in the work of uprooting Catholic England.

There follows a tirade against Italian literature and translations therefrom.

These be the enchantementes of Circes, brought out of Italie, to marre mens maners in England; much, by example of ill life, but more by preceptes of fonde bookes, of late translated out of Italian into English, sold in euery shop in London, commended by honest titles the soner¹ to corrupt honest maners; dedicated ouer boldlie to vertuous and honourable personages the easielier to begile simple and innocent wittes. It is pitie, that those, which haue authoritie and charge, to allow and disallow bookes to be printed, be no more circumspect herein, than they are. Ten sermons at Paules Crosse do not so much good for mouyng men to trewe doctrine, as one of those bookes do harme, with enticing men to ill liuing. Yea, I say farder, those bookes, tend not so much to corrupt honest liuing, as

¹ sooner.

they do, to subuert trewe Religion. Mo^r papistes be made, by your merry booke of Italie, than by your earnest booke of Louain. And bicause our great Phisicians do winke at the matter and make no counte of this sore, I, though not admitted one of their fellowship, yet hauyng bene many yeares a prentice to Gods trewe Religion, and trust to continewe a poore iorney man therein all dayes of my life, for the dewtie I owe, and loue I beare, both to trewe doctrine, and honest liuing, though I haue no authoritie to amend the sore my selfe, yet I will declare my good will, to discouer the sore to others.

A plain avowal, this, that the Catholic faith he had renounced, rather than moral perversion, aroused the writer's fears. Jewel's theatrical challenge to the imprisoned and gagged papists at St. Paul's Cross in November 1559, repeated in 1560, was deemed unwise by some of his fellow-Protestants, and his patently dishonest books had harmed them further. What Ascham and his like wanted was, it would seem, an iron curtain to keep English subjects from contact with papistry. This was applied, so far as they could enforce their decrees, by the ruling faction to the answers made by Harding, Stapleton, Dormer, Rastell and other English scholars abroad for conscience' sake, to the laborious falsehoods of Jewel's *Apology* (1562), and its sequels.

Ascham next launches out into reckless accusation and abuse of English Catholics.

Yet though in Italie they may freely be of no Religion as they are in Englande in verie deede to,² neuerthesse returning home into England they must countenance the profession of the one or the other, howsoever inwardlie they laugh to scorne both. And though, for their priuate matters they can follow, fawne, and flatter noble Personages, contrarie to them in all respectes, yet commonlie they allie themselues with the worst Papistes, to whom they be wedded, and do well agree together in three proper opinions: In open contempe of Goddes worde: in a secret securitie of sinne: and in a bloodie desire to haue all taken away, by sword and burning, that be not of their faction. They that do read, with indifferent iudgement, Pygius and Machiauel, two indifferent Patriarches of thies two Religions, do know full well what I say trewe.³

Ascham certainly could not without extreme impudence pose as a martyr. By his own confession Dr. Nicholas Metcalfe, the Catholic master of St. John's, Cambridge during Ascham's

¹ more.

² too.

³ P. 83.

student days (who resigned in 1537, because he would not own the Royal Supremacy on the Divorce, and died in 1539), was "parciall to none, but indifferent to all; a master for the whole, a father to every one in that college."¹ In Mary's reign Ascham not only lived unmolested, shielded by Gardiner from the few who sought to have him restricted, but was re-appointed Latin secretary to the Queen at a doubled salary.² "Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, High Chancellor of England," he avows, "treated me with the utmost humanity and favour, so that I cannot easily decide whether Paget was more ready to commend me, or Winchester to protect and favour me."³

In Italy, says Ascham, while a man must declare himself of some political party, Guelph, Ghibelline, French, Spanish, or other, he

shall neuer be compelled to be of any Religion: and if he medle not ouer much with Christes true Religion, he shall haue free libertie to embrace all religions, and becum, if he lust, at once, without let or punishment, Iewish, Turkish, Papish and Deuillish.⁴

Such, on his own showing, was the popish *tyranny* against which he ranted. If Ascham has anything definite in mind it was probably that perennial grievance of Puritans, that the Church calls sinners to repentance, and the latter (if grace of repentance be granted them) turn in their utmost need to her, and not to such man-made religions as that lately set up in England by Machiavel's arch-disciple William Cecil. The Bride of Christ is accused by later Pharisees of favouring sinners, some of them far from respectable.

Besides Italian writers Ascham inveighs heavily against the *Morte d'Arthure* romances, their bad morality, and the lazy monks and canons to whom he ascribes them, but has no word against Chaucer, who is in places, to say the least, far worse,

and yet ten *Morte Arthures* do not the tenth part so much harme, as one of these bookes made in Italie, and translated in England. They open, not fond and common wayes to vice, but such subtle, cunnyng, new and diuerse shiftes, to cary yong willes to vanitie, and yong wittes to mischief, to teach old bawdes new schole poyntes, as the simple head of an Englishman is not hable to inuent, nor

¹ Scholemaster, ed. 1863, p. 160.

² D.N.B.

³ Epist., ed. 1703, p. 51, in J. M. Stone, *Mary the First Queen of England*, 1901, pp. 374-5.

⁴ Scholemaster, 85-6.

neuer was hard of in England before, yea when Papistrie ouerflowed all. . . . There be moe¹ of these vngratious bookes set out in Printe within these fewe monethes, than haue bene sene in England many score yeare before.²

England had lost, rather than gained, if Ascham may be trusted, by the glorious Reformation for which he was so zealous. Italian novels, we are asked to believe, corrupt English youth to a degree unknown when England was Catholic, and at the same time convert them in large numbers, to Catholicism!

No doubt young men were more easily attracted by Italian romances than the closely reasoned learned apologetics of Stapleton, Harding and other serious books from Louvain, which it was also penal to read. In later days some have been known to take more readily to Jules Verne or Marion Crawford than to Franzelin or Billot.

To read Ascham one would suppose that translations of Italian novels were pouring from the London press in the 1560's. The books themselves appear to have been four or five in number, to wit William Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*, in two volumes, 1566-7, and G. Fenton's *Certaine Tragicall Discourses*, 1567. Painter put into very readable English stories taken from Boccaccio, Bandello and Straparola, including that of *Rhomeo and Julietta*, which served Shakespeare so well, while Fenton's work was a translation from Bandello. In his dedicatory letter to Lady Mary Sidney, Fenton claimed to have chosen out and Englished those stories with motives the very opposite to those which Ascham assigns him. Apart from Painter, Boccaccio was only known in English by his *Philosopo*, by H. G., 1567 (George Turberville's *Tragical Tales*, which contained a few from Boccaccio did not appear till 1587, nineteen years after Ascham's death). Sir Thomas Hoby's translation (1561), of Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano*, which is not a romance, had Ascham's own warm approval. Machiavelli was only available in English in his *Art of Warre*, 1560; we had no rendering of *Il Principe*, to which he chiefly owes his bad name, before 1640! In view of all this Ascham's invective seems, to say the least, a little extravagant. One must suppose him to refer to the number of printed copies of these very few writings to which our young innocents were so cruelly exposed.

It may occur to the reader that if love songs and unchaste

¹ more.

² Pp. 80-1.

stories were the cause of irreligion in the gilded youth of the 1560's they had little need to travel to Italy or seek translations of Italian works, when Chaucer for instance was readily available. Moreover, by far the most of Petrarch's poems (nearly all, I understand) are clean, many (like some of Chaucer's) also devout, and it is these which might well awaken a homesickness for "the old religion," like the best verse of Verlaine or Dowson in later days. Ascham seems to imply that immoral writings are a very persuasive to popery. To such silliness can learned fanatics descend! Again, if English youth were indeed more dissolute than ever before, after the new gospel had been at work among them for a generation, it seems a little unjust, a trifle far-fetched, to distribute the blame between Petrarch, with his inheritors, and the Pope!

We know, as Ascham probably did not, that some Catholics went so far as to court a reputation for atheism as a protective mask, at least in the latter part of the reign. It has been often suggested that Charles II did much the same. We may do well to bear this in mind when Ascham tells us of fast young men who

where they dare, in cumpany where they like, they boldlie laughe to scorne both protestant and Papist. They care for no scripture: they make no counte of generall counceles: they contemne the consent of the Chirch: They passe for no Doctores: They mocke the Pope: They raile on Luther: They allow neyther side: They like none, but onelie themselues.¹

These graceless ones do not even relish the (Protestant) Italian church in London, to which they only resort to hear the Italian tongue spoken.

That unbelief was by no means unknown in the earlier years of the reign we have other evidence. In William Bullein's *Dialogue* (1564) the then celebrated Dr. Burcot of London is brought in Erewhon-wise as Dr. Tocrub of Nodnol, who confides to his patient that he is a "nullifidian." There is reason, however, for deeming him a Catholic,² and so a case in point. Unbelief had taken root a generation earlier. In his book in defence of the unity of the Church (1536), the far-seeing Pole told Henry VIII that in denying the supremacy of the Holy See he was opening

¹ P. 82.

² In a list of notable papists of 1578 by Davie Jones we find: "Dr. Burcott, the physician who commonly heareth Mass at Mr. Browne's, the Baron."

the flood-gates to every anti-Christian denial. It is little to our credit that this great work yet awaits an English translator.

Ascham tries hard to persuade himself that Papistry and atheism are much the same, a verdict not unknown in Nero's days. Having denounced Machiavelli in a book rife with Cecil's praises our solemn Puritan proceeds to thank God that he knows so little of the Italy he is reviling.

I was once in Italie my selfe; But I thank God, my abode there was but ix dayes and yet I saw in that little tyme, in one Citie, more libertie to sinne than eu^{er} I hard tell of in our noble Citie of London in ix. yeare.¹

This reminds us of sundry Victorian travellers who raised their eyes and hands with horror at the enormity of French wickedness, on the strength of a flying visit to Paris—from London. We may venture to think that a man who makes a long, costly and difficult journey to a famous country, and then runs away almost immediately, is a little afraid lest his preconceived impressions should be shaken. Such a man will always contrive to find only what he is already resolved to find, and nothing else.

Ascham shakes his head sadly over the English youth who come under the spell of Italy.

They haue in more reuerence, the triumphes of Petrarche than the Genesis of Moses: they make more account of Tullies offices, than S. Paules epistles: of a tale in Bocace, than a storie of the Bible. They count as fables, the holie misteries of christian Religion. They make Christ and his Gospell onelie serue Ciuill policie. Then neyther Religion cummeth amisse to them. In tyme they be promoters of both openlie: in place againe mockers of both priuilie.²

St. Robert Bellarmine gave once for all the true answer to the many Protestant attempts to subpoena Petrarch and Boccaccio (and even Dante) as anti-catholic witnesses, namely that their failure was in morals and not in faith, and neither so much as dreamed that his writings would ever serve the enemies of the Church. On the other hand, we may add, if ever any man sought to make Christ and His Gospel serve civil policy, that man was Ascham's own belauded patron William Cecil.

Certainly Boccaccio was often a lascivious writer, as all good Catholics, Italian and other, deplore, but Chaucer, who had also

¹ Pp. 31-2.

² P. 83.

gravely offended in this, here passes muster. (*Cock Lorels Boat* was a very recent example of blasphemous writing in English.) Indeed to import "Gonzagadom" into England would have been a carriage of coals to Newcastle. The Leicesters and their like had little to learn from the courts of Italy. Indeed the very wickedest Italians in 1568 would hardly have believed that in nineteen years' time a sovereign, the Queen of Scotland, would be judicially murdered by Cecil and his minions. For that murder the "gentle" Parker, and his patron Sir Nicholas Bacon, were soon clamouring.

If only that desperate person were away, as by justice soon it might be, the Queen's Majesty's good subjects would be in better hope, and the papists' daily expectation vanquished.

Thus wrote Parker to Cecil in a letter dated 16 September, 1572.¹ At her mock trial the Earl of Kent blurted out that her death would be the life of the new "religion."

It is surely not unfair to conclude that Ascham was really, if unconsciously, moved by an uneasy anxiety about the permanence of the "true religion" set up by politic Machiavellians in 1559, after the ephemeral attempt in Edward's days and according in the main to the Edwardian model.

Italy and her culture undoubtedly did cast a spell upon the young and eager not yet annealed by the world of Cecil. To travel thither was indeed a revealing experience, dreaded by the contrivers of the new state cult for its effect on young and generous minds, much as the satraps of Moscow dread any true knowledge of the normal human life penetrating into the "paradise of the workers." A few years later Sir Philip Sidney's Protestant friends were scared by a rumour that he was like to turn Papist on the Continent. We know that he met Campion (whom his father Sir Henry Sidney had shielded in Dublin) in Bohemia, and even professed himself intellectually convinced of the truth of Catholicism, he who was soon after to marry the daughter of Francis Walsingham, the Goebbels of his day, and to accept the homage of Giordano Bruno. Antony Bacon, elder brother of Francis, was urged homewards by a like scare on his mother's part. More than a generation later Sir Thomas Browne declared that at the sight of a crucifix he could dispense with his hat but

¹ *Corresp. Parker Soc.*, p. 398.

scarcely with the thought of his Saviour. That very sight made the Elizabethan prelates, Cox and Jewel (the official apologists of Anglicanism) among them, rave and blaspheme.

In truth it was not the Italy of Machiavelli or Gonzaga that alarmed the enemies of the Faith, but the Italy of Raphael, Michelangelo and Tasso, and still more the spirit of Christian Rome, where travellers would naturally visit the English Hospice (soon, in 1578, to give place to the Venerabile) already a noted refuge of exiles who had given up all for the faith of Christendom and placed the love of Christ before the worship of Caesar. What that Italy was to do for English culture (to say nothing of what she had done already) is seen in the work of Blessed Robert Southwell, martyred in 1595, whose genius not even the Elizabethan persecution could stifle. Professor Janelle has furthermore claimed him as the true source of that Caroline Christian culture so often deemed distinctly Anglican.¹

Roger Ascham's instinct was a true one. It was the Italy of the baptized Renaissance, not that of Boccaccio's already long past generation, that awoke his misgivings. It is simply untrue that Raphael and Michelangelo were only humanists who happened to be Catholics. They sought not the slavish imitation of classical art but rather its Christian transcending and transforming. St. Peter's dome is not a classical exercise but a work of Christian genius far above those that gave Michelangelo its first suggestion. Whatever they may think of the building as a whole, normal men regard with awe and reverence that crowning dome, akin to soaring medieval spires, uplifting heavenward its triumphant Cross.

No one understands Italy who deems her culture an enthrallment to the classics of pagan antiquity. It is rather the christening on Ausonian soil of nature transformed by grace, and therefore in harmony, as mere humanism could never be, with the simplicity of folk-art and the popular religious festivals. Professor A. W. Pollard ends a happy description of the simple drama that accompanied many holydays in peasant Italy with the words: "Not from vapid imitations of Euripides and Terence, but from such simple customs as these did the religious Drama take its beginnings."²

¹ *Robert Southwell the Writer* (English trans. 1935), by Pierre Janelle.

² *English Miracle Plays*, Intr., p. xiv.

If any Tudor youth was inclined to vice he had little need of distant travel to become an unhappy proficient. Lack of travel does not save a Robert Burns or an Ernest Dowson. Indeed the notion is, for any who have any knowledge of Tudor England, or even of human nature, despite Ascham's dismal solemnity, absurd. Ascham's fear of Italy was real enough, but his renegade prejudice disguised, even from himself, its true motive.

The spell of Italy has indeed wrought powerfully upon English travellers all down the generations, especially upon young aspiring souls, and the heart of that spell, whether followed or resisted, has surely been the call of the ancient faith of England and Christendom, and not to English Protestants or pagans alone. Even Goethe, who ignored St. Francis at Assisi, could not quite pass by St. Peter or his successor in Rome. Take a few names at random, Lord Edward Herbert of Cherbury, John Milton, John Evelyn, Gray, Gibbon, Byron, Shelley, Browning, Ruskin, whom you will, follow them to Rome, watch their sojourn in the heart of Christendom, and you will discern, I submit, invariably, piercing through their antiquarian, scholarly or artistic quest, ever and anon, loved, heeded, neglected, or resisted, the still small voice of the Faith once delivered to the saints. This surely is what Ascham and his like instinctively dreaded.

THE JESUITS IN NORTHERN BRAZIL

I

FATHER SERAFIM LEITE, S.J. covers what is now the northern half of Brazil in the third, fourth and fifth volumes of his *História da Companhia de Jesus no Brasil*. Illustrating the scale of this study we may note that these three volumes, comprising more than 1,500 pages, occupied the author seven years (1938-45) in their composition.

The geographical area covered by the North Brazil missions was enormous and the environment both physical and human varied very considerably. Father Leite's treatment of his subject is never parochial. In the Preface of the third volume he puts the North Brazil missions into perspective by pointing out that we have here only part of a world-wide enterprise, namely Portuguese colonial expansion, within

which framework the Jesuit missionaries achieved so many of their greatest actions. The repercussions between parallel colonizing movements in Asia, Africa and America are soon found to multiply, witness flora, art and letters.

Volumes III and IV are devoted to what is now known as the "extreme north" of Brazil, that is the present States of Ceará, Maranhão, Pará and Amazonas, formerly making up the Vice-Province of Maranhão. The third volume covers, geographically, the Vice-Province by main centres, settlements and missions. The main centres were the coastal towns of São Luiz do Maranhão and Belém do Pará, where Colleges were established in the first half of the seventeenth century. The settlements included many *aldeias* (Indian villages), and among them the largest in all the Brazils, namely Ibiapaba, which counted 4,000 souls. There were also important Jesuit *fazendas*, both plantations and ranches, some of them presented to the Society by pious donors and others founded by the Fathers themselves as part of their planned activity to provide their nomadic Indian converts with a means of support and a fixed occupation. By the middle of the eighteenth century there were many such Jesuit farms in Maranhão and all along the coastal region of northern Brazil. They were generally large and well equipped, producing crops of rice, sugar, manioc, maize, beans and cotton, and supplied with their own workshops, mills and other necessary installations. Among the ranches further inland we may cite the *aldeia* of Maracu which supported the College of Maranhão and had 15,600 cattle and 500 horses. Elsewhere oranges, lemons, coffee and cocoa were planted in quantity. Despite allegations of their detractors, the Jesuits were not, however, miners. The gold mines of Pinaré in the interior mountains, said to yield the Society huge quantities of bullion, were a myth.

Life continued to be hazardous for the Jesuits well into the eighteenth century due to occasional Indian intransigence: Father João de Vilar, for example, was killed by Indians in 1719.

The island of Marajó was another important centre of Jesuit activity. The celebrated Antônio Vieira, whose influence dominated the Vice-Province of Maranhão in the latter half of the seventeenth century, described the "fortaleza silvestre" of Marajó in the following picturesque fashion: "In the great Mouth of the Amazon is an Island, greater than the whole Kingdom of Portugal, inhabited by countless Nations of Indians." On Marajó we can in fact observe the whole pattern of Jesuit enterprise in miniature—war between the Indians and the Portuguese colonists, pacification by fearless Jesuit missionaries, settlement of the Indians and the establishment of large farms, here mainly cattle ranches, which continue to this day to provide the livelihood of the population of the island.

The immense jungles of the Amazon basin, watered by six of the largest rivers in the world—the Tocantins, Xingú, Tapajós, Madeira, Solimões and Negro—were the scene of perhaps the most spectacular of all the Jesuit explorations. The penetration of this region came comparatively late, belonging to the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The suppression of the Society in 1759 cut off the Amazon Missions at a comparatively early stage, and it is impossible to calculate the loss to Brazil thus incurred. What is ironical is that the Portuguese Government were able to establish the boundaries of Brazil so far west against the counter-claims of Spanish Peru by citing the missionary settlements of the same Portuguese Jesuits whom they so unscrupulously proscribed. The *aldeia* of Javari, founded in 1752, being the furthest point of Jesuit penetration in the western Amazon, was established as the Brazilian frontier and remains so to this day.

In Volume IV Father Leite, following his carefully thought-out method of presentation, moves on from the geographical survey of the previous volume to a general review of the many different aspects of Jesuit activity throughout the "extreme north." In particular he devotes special sections to the struggle waged by the Society under the inspired leadership of Antônio Vieira with the Portuguese settlers to establish the freedom of the Indians; fortunately Vieira had the ear of the King and was able to prevent the wholesale enslavement which would otherwise undoubtedly have taken place. Other sections of this volume are devoted to the government and regulation of the *aldeias*; Jesuit colonization, farming and industry; the organization and recruiting of the Missions; and the manifold activity of the Fathers in their unique capacity as hospitallers and doctors, scientists, cartographers, ethnographers, linguists, historians and patrons of the arts. Incidentally the high level of Jesuit learning brought to this remote region is well witnessed by the catalogue of the library at Vigia, a small establishment in the Amazon delta; this catalogue is given in one of the Appendices of Volume IV and contains over a thousand volumes in several languages, covering the widest variety of subjects. The library of the College at São Luiz had, we are told, up to 5,000 books.

Some of the most interesting passages in Serafim Leite's fourth volume are those dealing with the character and moral and legal status of Jesuit property ownership. The fundamental problem facing the missionaries was that the country was entirely undeveloped and the Indians at best semi-nomadic. There were, of course, never enough missionaries and colonization used up energies which could ill be spared from the primary task of evangelization; yet without colonization there could be no lasting conversion and there would be no effective means of subsistence.

In Father Leite's fifth volume the scene shifts from the "extreme

north" to the north-east of Brazil, namely the present States of Bahia, Pernambuco, Piauí, and the small States in between. This was the part of Brazil which was earliest settled and most thickly populated. During the seventeenth century the Dutch, under the exceptionally able leadership of Count Maurice of Nassau, established themselves in Pernambuco and dominated the whole area. They were there in strength from 1630 to 1654, largely invulnerable as a result of their naval supremacy in the Atlantic. Their defeat, however, in the maritime wars with England in the middle of the century changed their fortunes in Brazil, weakening them to such an extent that the local Portuguese were finally able to expel them with the aid of Indians recruited by the Jesuits from their *aldeias*.

An interesting but fortunately exceptional figure of the period of the Dutch invasion was Father Manuel de Morais, a *mestizo*, born in São Paulo in 1596 of Portuguese and Indian parentage. He entered the Society at Rio de Janeiro in 1613, studied seven years in the College there and then took up missionary duties in the *aldeias* of Pernambuco where he distinguished himself as an intrepid leader of the Indians against the Dutch. The war seems to have undermined his moral stability and when in 1635 he was captured by the Dutch he suffered a moral collapse and discarded his priestly habit. His captors shipped him to Holland where he appears to have turned Calvinist, married twice and had three sons. In 1642 he was tried by the Inquisition at Lisbon and condemned in absence. Next year he returned to the Dutch colony of Pernambuco where he set up in business but soon began to abandon Calvinism in favour of his original faith and shortly afterwards deserted the Dutch altogether, rejoining the Indians and leading them once more with all his old courage and devotion against the Dutch. He was, however, soon apprehended by the Portuguese authorities and in 1647 condemned to perpetual imprisonment at Lisbon, but with recommendations for clemency on account of his voluntary return and his services in the wars. His prison sentence was in consequence much diminished and lasted less than two years, but he did not live long to enjoy his new liberty, dying in 1651. Manuel de Morais illustrates a very rare phenomenon, namely apostasy, which may be attributed to the fact that before he had completed his studies he found himself entirely alone in the difficult and chaotic circumstances of the war in Pernambuco. What is interesting is that even so his fundamental Jesuit training eventually reasserted itself and obliged him to return voluntarily despite the certainty of severe punishment. His is an isolated, if not unique, case in the annals of the Society in Brazil, but perhaps worth recalling for that very reason.

The city of Salvador da Bahia, the then capital of Brazil, was attacked and temporarily occupied by the Dutch during their period

of ascendancy but here again the Jesuits played a very active part in enlisting their Indian villagers to repel the invasion. The Dutch had little or no lasting effect upon Brazil but it is interesting to note that long after their final expulsion, the Jesuit missionaries far up in the interior would from time to time encounter Calvinist Indians, survivors of missionary activity by the Dutch ministers.

As elsewhere, the Jesuits in north-east Brazil were great champions of the freedom of the Indians and the only really effective educational force. The Colleges of Salvador da Bahia, Olinda and subsequently Recife, were among the most considerable Jesuit establishments outside Europe. In and near Salvador there were a whole series of Jesuit Houses and Foundations, besides the College; in particular the Novitiate of Giquitaia and the Seminary of Belém da Cachoeira. The latter (founded 1687) was the first resident training College established in Brazil and consequently of great importance. The Novitiate was founded in 1705 by one of the three or four great pioneers and frontiersmen of north-east Brazil, "the pious and illustrious *sertanista*" Domingos Afonso Mafrense, nicknamed Sertão (Desert). He was the "discoverer" or rather the first important settler in the interior region of Piauí, and liked to regard himself as an unofficial "Brother" of the Society. On his death in 1711, he bequeathed thirty large *fazendas* stretching one hundred leagues along the River Piauí, with 30,000 cattle and 1,500 horses, to the care of the Rector of the Jesuit College at Bahia "until the end of the world," the revenues thereof to support his foundation, the Novitiate of Giquitaia. The administration of these great frontier ranches taxed the manpower resources of the Jesuits but their presence had a stabilizing influence on the development of Piauí at a critical early stage in the history of that "Wild West" State.

II. BRITISH JESUITS IN BRAZIL. 1550-1760

Father Leite has devoted the eighth and ninth volumes to a bibliography of the Jesuits of the Province of Brazil and Vice-Province of Maranhão during the two centuries 1550 to 1760. Among the great number of Jesuits covered by this compendium there are four Englishmen, a Scot and three Irishmen who certainly represent the best qualities of their respective nations. It may therefore be of interest to recount briefly their careers.

In the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries there are three notable figures, the Englishmen John Vincent Yate and John Meade, and the Irishman Thomas Fields.

John Yate was born about 1550 at Salisbury, entered the Society in 1574, and in the following year went from Rome to the University of Coimbra in Portugal. From Coimbra he went on to Lisbon where he

studied moral theology and embarked for Brazil in 1577. He devoted himself to missionary activity in the north-east of Brazil and undertook extensive journeys into the interior *sertões*. His letters from "Saint Anthony Village, 40 miles from the Bay of All Saints" dated 1593 to the Rev. Richard Gibbon, S.J., at Madrid, and to Sir Francis Englefield, are contained in the Calendar of State Papers (1591-4) Volume CCXLV. In the second letter he describes how the privateer Thomas Cavendish, in 1592, attacked the Brazilian village of Espirito Santo, "where he lost forty persons and eight of his men were taken alive; and seeing water and earth fighting against him he burnt one of his sails for lack of mariners and masts and went his way, but whither no man knoweth; being well whipped with the scourge of God."

John Meade was born about 1572 in London but went to Portugal as a child where he was brought up by a merchant of Viana do Castelo, a friend of his father, who educated him, taught him his business and sent him to Brazil. While in Brazil João de Almeida, as he was called, became acquainted with the Jesuits of Pernambuco and entered the Society in 1592. He showed no facility for study and apparently only just learned enough to become ordained. He devoted himself to the practical task of missionary activity among the Indians and distinguished himself by his remarkable journeys into the interior. In the last years of his life he gave proofs of extraordinary virtue and piety, and when he died in 1653 at Rio de Janeiro he was generally regarded as a saint, being held as one who had uttered prophecies and worked miracles. The biography of this venerable Father, "the second thau-maturge of Brazil," was published at Lisbon in two volumes in 1658 and 1662.

The third of our early British Jesuits in Brazil was the Irishman Thomas Fields, who was born at Limerick in 1549, son of a doctor, William Fields. He studied in Paris, Douai and Louvain, and entered the Society at Rome in 1574. He walked from Italy to Portugal, then left Lisbon for Brazil in 1578 and worked in the Indian villages of southern Brazil where he became fluent in the Tupí-Guaraní language. He is described as a man of great zeal and virtue. Subsequently he embarked from Bahia (1586) upon the Paraguay mission arriving two years later and becoming one of the founders of that remarkable enterprise to which he devoted the rest of his life. On his way to Paraguay his ship was intercepted by the privateer Robert Withrington, who carried letters of marque from the Portuguese claimant to the Crown of Portugal (Philip II of Spain had succeeded to the Portuguese throne in 1580). Withrington plundered the missionaries and removed the sails of their ship, which, however, fortunately drifted into Buenos Aires. Fields and two colleagues finally reached Asuncion in 1588. There is an interesting letter of his dated 1601 to the General in which

he argues in favour of bringing the Paraguay mission under the Province of Brazil—communications with Brazil being so much easier than those with Peru. This argument was not settled until Paraguay was created a separate Province in 1607. "In 1626 he died at Asuncion having spent about ten years in Brazil and forty in the missions of Paraguay, of which he and Ortega were the founders and in which for more than three years he was the only representative of the Society." Undoubtedly Thomas Fields was a remarkable pioneer and, by virtue of being a founder of the Paraguay mission, a distinguished historical figure. Appropriately therefore he is recorded in the *Dictionary of National Biography* and has been the subject of a special article in THE MONTH.

Belonging to the seventeenth century there are the Englishman Ignatius Lee and the Irishman Richard Carew. Ignatius Lee was born in 1599 in Staffordshire and is sometimes referred to from his birth-place as Ignatius Stafford. He joined the Society in Spain in 1619 and was ordained in 1636. He was principally distinguished as a mathematician and taught mathematics at the College of Santo Antão in Lisbon. His connection with Brazil was comparatively brief, being confined to two years (1640-1) spent in Bahia as confessor of the Viceroy, the Marques de Montalvão. He returned to Lisbon with the Viceroy and died there in 1642. Among other writings he produced several mathematical works printed at Lisbon in the 1630's.

Richard Carew was born at Waterford and entered the Society at Lisbon in 1639. He was appointed Professor of Moral Theology at the College of Angra in the Azores but volunteered for the Maranhão Mission to which he was transferred in 1657. In 1658 he explored the Tocantins River and later became Superior of the College of Maranhão. In 1661 he was expelled with the other Fathers by an insurrection, and returned to Portugal, from which he finally departed in 1668 for his native Ireland where he died thirty years later. He is described as a learned and virtuous man.

The last three British Jesuits in Father Leite's bio-bibliography belong to the eighteenth century. The first is the Irishman, Thomas Lynch, who was born in 1685 at Galway. He was the son of Catholic parents, and studied the humanities in his native country. At the age of eighteen he emigrated to Lisbon and joined the Irish seminary there to study philosophy and theology with the intention of being ordained and returning to Ireland. After studying at Lisbon and also at Évora he decided that the Brazil missions would provide his true vocation, and he embarked at Lisbon for Bahia in 1709. He is described as of prudent and saintly disposition and was a distinguished preacher. He occupied a series of important administrative positions in the Province of Brazil, finally becoming Provincial. During this period he is said to have

converted many Protestants to the Catholic faith. He left Brazil in 1760 for Lisbon and died at Rome in 1761.

A close contemporary of Thomas Lynch was the Scotsman, Robert Field, known as Roberto de Campos, who was born about 1692 at Dundee. He was converted to Catholicism in Brazil, possibly by Lynch himself, entered the Society at the age of twenty-two and was ordained at Recife (Pernambuco) in 1731. Among other positions he held were that of Professor of Theology in the College of Bahia and Rector of the College at Rio de Janeiro, where he died in 1753. It is interesting to note that he was instrumental in converting his compatriot John Millet, also from Dundee, who had taken part in an English expedition against Spanish America, had subsequently travelled to Rio de Janeiro, was converted there and became a Jesuit at the age of twenty-six in 1742. Known as João Vieira, he was an active missionary until his death, which occurred by shipwreck in 1754.

The last of our British Jesuits, Francis Atkins, was also a convert. He was born in 1733 at Bombay but was educated in England at Greenwich. As his father was "one of the Governors of the East India Company" he was early marked out for a post in India. On his way there his ship called at Bahia where he met a Jesuit compatriot and was converted to the Catholic faith, which he publicly embraced in the Chapel of the Jesuit College on 10 August 1749. The Captain of the East Indiaman tried to recall him and requested the Viceroy to intervene; but the latter refused to act and the ship sailed, leaving Francis Atkins in Bahia where he received a most friendly welcome and three years later entered the Society of Jesus. He was still studying philosophy in the College at Bahia when in 1759 the Society of Jesus was suppressed throughout the Portuguese dominions. Together with his fellow Jesuits he was deported to Lisbon and spent most of his later years in prison. Finally released in 1777 he died in the following year.

Between them these eight very different personalities reflect not only the characteristics of their native islands but also sum up to a remarkable degree many different aspects of Jesuit activity from the mid-sixteenth to mid-eighteenth century in Portuguese America.

Elsewhere in his History (Volume VII, p. 269) Father Leite mentions other less eminent Britons who belonged to the Society in Brazil. There was Brother Roberto de Campos, an Irishman of great humility and virtue who was educated at Oporto, entered the Society at the age of twenty-five in 1662, proved himself an excellent schoolmaster in Brazil and died at Rio de Janeiro in 1711. William Price, born in London, was converted to Catholicism in Pernambuco and entered the Society in 1734 as a Brother, being thereafter employed in agricultural administration. Brother Francis David, a Scot, and another convert, entered the Society in Brazil in 1745 and became pilot of the ship

belonging to the Society. Others were Alexandre de Lima Junior, an Englishman born at Louvain (entered 1723, aged twenty-six) who died at Rio de Janeiro in 1727 while studying for priesthood, Brother João da Silveira an Irishman (entered 1748), Brother José Maria of London (entered 1748, aged twenty-two), Brother Tomás Honorato an Englishman (entered 1749, aged nineteen), Brother Tomás Luiz of Edinburgh (entered 1750, aged twenty-five) and Brother João Ferreira (Fidgett) of Colchester (entered 1752, aged twenty-nine).

As a result of these and other conversions in the eighteenth century, Salvador da Bahia gained a special reputation as an English-speaking Catholic centre for British Catholics on voyage to and from the East Indies. Summing up, Father Serafim Leite finally concludes that the British recruits to the Society, in Brazil during the colonial period, represented "a relatively numerous group of active, zealous and useful Jesuits, in particular the Scots."

III. CONCLUSION

The tenth volume contains a complete index of the whole work, list of illustrations and contents by chapters. There is also a bibliography of notices and reviews published up to 1949. This excellent index is an invaluable adjunct to a work of such magnitude and is the final proof, if any were wanting, of the patience and care devoted by the author to his task. Each volume has its own index, but, not content with that, Father Leite has indexed the whole work and by this considerable extra undertaking has made his History fully accessible for purposes of reference. Such thoughtful concern for the requirements of readers is by no means universal and Father Leite deserves great credit for it.

For the excellent and abundant illustrations (there are nearly 250), Father Leite more than once acknowledges the generous help received from Dr. Rodrigo Melo Franco de Andrade, Director of the Department of the National Historical and Artistic Patrimony in the Brazilian Ministry of Education. This comes as no surprise because Dr. Rodrigo has been associated with many important publications on history, sociology and the arts in Brazil over the last twenty years or more. The debt which Brazil owes to this remarkable man is still insufficiently realized, but Father Leite obviously appreciates it well. The seven maps are the work of Father Leite himself and they provide useful graphic summaries of the missions complete with dates.

Finally, the production is excellent throughout. The first three volumes were printed at Oporto in Portugal, the remainder produced at Rio de Janeiro by the National Press of Brazil. Type, paper and layout are first-class throughout and the publishers are to be congratulated.

lated for the care they have worthily devoted to what is undoubtedly one of the most important large scale histories of the twentieth century.

J. B. BURY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

JOHN YATE

Calendar of State Papers, Edw. VI, Eliz., Jas. I, Vol. CCXLV (1591-4), pp. 353-6.

Foley, *Records of the English Province*, I, pp. 286-95.

JOHN MEADE

Foley, *Records of the English Province*, VII, pp. 1321-39.

THOMAS FIELDS

Dictionary of National Biography, Vol XVIII, p. 414.

Hogan, Father Thomas Filde, *THE MONTH*, 1890, Vol. LXX, pp. 345 and 514.

Gwynn, Father Thomas Fihilly, *The Irish Way*, 1932, pp. 155-67.

IGNATIUS LEE

The Catholic Miscellany, June, 1823.

Collections illustrating the History of the Catholic Religion, 1857, pp. 204-5.

Morris, *The Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers*, Series I, p. 613.

RICHARD CAREW

J. McErlean, "Irish Jesuits in Foreign Missions 1574-1773," *The Irish Jesuit Directory*, 1930, p. 128.

THOMAS LYNCH

J. McErlean, *op.cit.*, *The Irish Jesuit Directory*, 1930, p. 129.

A NOTE ON GERARD HOPKINS

SO MUCH HAS BEEN WRITTEN in recent years on the poetry and prose of Hopkins that it might be thought the subject is exhausted. In poetry of any magnitude, however, and in poetry which is as difficult as Hopkins's, there will always remain problems of interpretation. I wish to comment on *The Wreck of the Deutschland* and show a possible connection with the "dark sonnets" of his last years.

The Wreck of the Deutschland is the first in order and in time of the mature poems. In a letter to Canon Dixon, Hopkins explains how he came to write it.

"But when in the winter of '75 the *Deutschland* was wrecked in the mouth of the Thames and five Franciscan nuns, exiles from Germany by the Falk Laws, aboard of her were drowned, I was affected by the account and happening to say so to my rector he said that he wished someone would write a poem on the subject. On this hint I set to work and, though my hand was out at first, produced one."

The poem is amongst his greatest, but on the interpretation of it critics differ. In an article in the *Dublin Review* in 1948, Mr. Francis Ryan says that the central theme is the mastery of God over mankind, and more specifically God's action to assert that mastery and bring all men to an acknowledgment of it through the grace of Christ. Fr. Peters, on the other hand, holds that this poem and *The Eurydice* as well, "are inspired by his sorrow at the news of so many sailors meeting their sudden death unprepared; it is the problem of suffering that racked the mind of Hopkins, who wondered why it was that people should meet their end 'comfortless, unconfessed.' This thought has stirred the emotions far more intensely than the death of the Franciscan nuns exiled from Germany, even granted that this was the original theme of the poem." In an essay in *Immortal Diamond*, Fr. Albert R. Boyle disagrees with both these views. He maintains that Hopkins is not dealing directly with the problem of suffering. He is concerned with the mystery of God's grace in us and the mastery and the power of Christ. This is not a poem of the Passion, but of the triumph which flowed from the Passion.

There is evidence for each of these views to be found in the poem. In the first stanza the mastery of God is mentioned, and the prayer in the last stanza is for the triumph of Christ over English souls. Undoubtedly, also, Hopkins is moved to write by the story of the tragedy and loss at sea of so many lives; he is stirred too by the thought of so many dying "comfortless, unconfessed," and throughout the poem he has in mind the "mystery of God's grace in us." But

while these thoughts are present they are linked up with an emotional discovery or new realization of the significance of the suffering and death of the five nuns. God is the master, and we say "yes O at lightning and lashed rod;" "we kiss our hand to the stars, lovely-asunder starlight, wafting God out of it." We recognize His mastery, but there is mystery in His coming, and the mystery is revealed in the death of this "tall nun." God's advent is not in bliss, as we expect. We are often scandalized at the tragedies of the good. "Here the faithful waver, the faithless fable and miss." What we miss is the mystery and mastery of the Passion. Hopkins describes vividly how a new understanding dawns on him, as he comes to see that God is "lightning and love," a "winter and warm," and that He has His "dark descending and most art merciful then."

The new realization then consists in this, that God's ways are unexpected and above all most unexpected, in that suffering and death manifest His coming and His victorious providence. Death is a natural tragedy, for we dream that we are "rooted in earth," and forget that there "must the sour scythe cringe, and the blear share come." But what is apparently loss is the mode of the Passion, the way Christ comes and moves to His resurrection. The scene of the wreck is then described, and Hopkins focuses on the tall nun. She is a Franciscan, and here is another clue; for St. Francis bore the mark and cipher of the suffering Christ, "the seal of his seraph arrival." It is not surprising, therefore, that the nuns of St. Francis are "sisterly sealed in wild waters, To bathe in his fall-gold mercies, to breathe in his all-fire glances." The climax of the discovery lies in the cry of the tall nun; "she to the black-about air . . . was calling 'O Christ, Christ, come quickly': The cross to her she calls Christ to her, christens her wild-worst Best."

This last line is the burden of *The Wreck of the Deutschland*. The nun had recognized the mastery of God and His providence as it works through the Passion to the triumph of the Resurrection. She "Read the unshapeable shock night And knew the who and the why." The poem naturally ends then with a reassertion of the mastery of God, who is also "throned behind Death with a sovereignty that heeds but hides, bodes but abides." This wreck and apparent tragedy must be read by those who know the mystery of Christ as a mercy; it must be seen as a way of love which "glides Lower than death and the dark," and brings hope to those who are "past-prayer, pent in prison, The-last-breath penitent spirits." Fittingly the last stanza is a prayer to the nun that she remember those who have not her faith and a prayer that Christ may once more come and master English souls.

If this interpretation be right we can make a connection of the

thought in it with the dark sonnets written in his last years. It would seem as if Hopkins was realizing a truth which he felt he needed to know, as if he has a premonition that he would need the lesson for himself. This is not such an unusual experience. The lives of human beings are often so much of one piece that what they themselves thought to be new and original ideas and experiences can be found waiting to be taken up in their earliest writings. This anticipation may be unconscious, or it may be a vague presentiment. Hopkins clearly felt intensely the problem of the wreck of the *Deutschland*, the hardness of the fate of the drowned, the challenge to providence in the death of the five nuns who had placed all their trust in God. The answer came to him with tremendous force. The risen Christ bears the marks of His suffering, and "he scores it in scarlet himself on his own bespoken." In suffering and loneliness God is near.

My second point is this. If this interpretation of *The Wreck of the Deutschland* be right, then it is not far-fetched to trace a connection between this great opening poem and the "dark sonnets" at the end of his life. It is as if he carried his own fate within himself and had a presentiment of a mystery he would have to face in his own experience. The tall nun is the image of himself blown upon by a storm and swimming in dark waters. The realization came to him that when a soul feels lost and the "last strands of manhood are untwisted," when there are "cliffs of fall, frightful, sheer, no-man fathomed," that Christ is then most "kind, but royally reclaiming his own." "Thou . . . hast thy dark descending and most art merciful then." But it is one thing to realize this truth in the remarkable incident of the nun calling Christ to her amid the storm; it is quite another to do so in the undramatic and unheroic miseries of bad health and the nerve racking routine of life. "I wake and feel the fell of dark, not day. . . . And my lament Is cries countless, cries like dead letters sent To dearest him that lives alas! away." "She to the black-about air, to the breaker, the thickly Falling flakes, to the throng that catches and quails Was calling 'O Christ, Christ, come quickly'." The nun "christens her wild-worst Best" on the Goodwin Sands; he had to do so in a stuffy lecture room and in a Dublin street.

M. C. D'ARCY

REVIEWS

PHILOSOPHY AND LANGUAGE

Philosophical Investigations, by Ludwig Wittgenstein. Translated by G. E. M. Anscombe (Blackwell 37s 6d).

LIKE SO MANY DISTINGUISHED PHILOSOPHERS — Socrates, Descartes, Spinoza, Schopenhauer—the late Ludwig Wittgenstein was, in the best sense of the word, an amateur. He began as an engineer, and apart from a short period of lecturing at Cambridge, was not officially connected with any institution or movement. Although he liked certain works by certain philosophers (Augustine's *Confessions* was a favourite) he did not read widely in philosophy. He had little philosophical knowledge and no degree when he went to Cambridge. But he thought things out for himself in a highly original and independent manner, and made a deep impression upon a discerning few with his *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. Like Descartes, he set out to change our *mode* of thinking, and his book resembled Descartes' *Discourse* in its brevity and concentration. After the *Tractatus* he produced nothing but a complicated mass of notes from which at length emerged the outline of the present book, ably translated and seen through the press by Mrs. G. E. M. Anscombe. (The original German text is printed alongside the translation.) It goes beyond and away from the *Tractatus*, and can be read as it stands, without knowledge of the earlier book. But some knowledge of the author's aims and methods would help, and it is a pity that Mrs. Anscombe did not provide an Introduction on the lines of her admirable Third Programme talks. Perhaps this will be done in a later edition.

Philosophical Investigations is built up of short sections, related, not by an objective scheme or sustained argument, but by the author's underlying method of approach. His chief aim was to raise questions about the *use* of language and to raise them in a new way: to make us re-think the apparently trivial and obvious by attending to aspects of linguistic construction that we had overlooked. He attempted to show that the most simple and taken-for-granted statements can conceal problems of extraordinary interest and complexity; and he sought to clarify, and finally to dissolve, these problems by stressing the importance of understanding the use of words in what he called "the language game." Undoubtedly his attitude had a formative influence on the linguistic movement in contemporary philosophy, and on certain aspects of Logical Positivism. But the Logical Positivists perverted him, much as Marx perverted Hegel—and in the same atheistic direction. Wittgenstein had none of the positivists' contempt for metaphysics. Their

ridiculous attempt to dismiss God and the whole choir of heaven as a syntactical mistake was a result of exaggerating isolated elements in his earlier work. Wittgenstein held religion, and particularly the Catholic religion, in great respect; and it was to a Catholic, his trusted friend Mrs. Anscombe, that he left his manuscripts.

He employed a sparse and deceptively simple style; and if we can judge by the translation (which is said to be a very faithful representation of the German) it was not a good style in the literary sense. In one way it is clear, in another obscure. The diction and syntax of each particular sentence is clear, but the cumulative effect of the sentences is peculiar. The following, for example, is typical of the style of the whole book:

Let us examine the proposition: "This is how things are."—How can I say that this is the general form of propositions?—It is first and foremost *itself* a proposition, an English sentence, for it has a subject and a predicate. But how is the sentence applied—that is, in our everyday language? For I got it from there and nowhere else.

We may say, *e.g.*: "He explained his position to me, said that this was how things were, and that therefore he needed an advance." So far, then, one can say that that sentence stands for any statement. It is employed as a propositional *schema*, but *only* because it has the construction of an English sentence . . .

Each sentence of the above is clear and almost colloquial. But the passage as a whole is obscure, and requires reading several times to get its meaning. It is strange that a man so much concerned with the analysis of sentences should put together his own sentences in such an obscure manner. In the early days, Bertrand Russell (who had long and mutually influential talks with Wittgenstein) wondered if he was a crank or a genius. Perhaps he was a rather cranky genius.

Some of Wittgenstein's questions tend to dissipate in an endless regress of other questions—a kind of philosophical worrying. This nervous questing is reflected in many aspects of modern art and literature: in Stravinsky and Schonberg, in Picasso, and most of all in Joyce. It is partly the expression of our restless, questing century; and to this extent Wittgenstein was a child of his time. His influence has been very great, and no doubt the linguistic phase in philosophy has been useful. But it has been exaggerated by superficial philosophers. Wittgenstein was never superficial, nor did he ever dogmatize. His book must be read in the independent spirit in which it was conceived, and every reader must interpret and develop it for himself. Whatever the interpretation, few will deny its originality and provocative power. Once having read it the experience remains.

ROBERT HAMILTON

NEW AND OLD ABOUT SCRIPTURE

Cardinal Newman's Doctrine of Holy Scripture, by J. Seynaeve, W.F. (Louvain University Publications and Basil Blackwell, n.p.).

A New Testament Commentary for English Readers: Vol. I, the Four Gospels, by Mgr. R. A. Knox (Burns and Oates 18s).

The Disciple Who Wrote These Things, by Canon H. E. Edwards (James Clarke 12s 6d).

DR. SEYNAEVE'S IMMENSE BOOK makes use of unpublished documents illustrating Newman's little-studied doctrine of Scripture according as it developed. The labour involved was vast, since Newman never systematized his thought in this matter, nor had he had a scriptural training; he was essentially a controversialist, and he was all too well aware of the rising flood of criticism. He began to disentangle his ideas in the "Inspiration Papers" of 1861-3, which he abruptly stopped, not only because 1864 was occupied with writing the *Apologia*, but because he had been going through the "lowest water" of his career; and while he was tormented by the thought of younger Catholics being bewildered by the clash of faith with science, he considered that the Church wished her representatives to hold their tongue. What he wrote in 1884 was already more serene and nearer accuracy: but he was still without the guidance of Leo XIII's *Providentissimus* (1893), which gave not only safeguards but an immense stimulus to Biblical research. Pius XII's *Divino Afflante* (1943—the fiftieth anniversary of the former encyclical) shows what enormous progress has been made since Newman's time, owing to the prudent checks and warm encouragement issuing from the Holy See. Clearly we have no space to exhibit in detail Newman's groping after conclusions as to Inspiration, or to comment on his Hermeneutic principles—all of which is exhaustively done in this magistral and quite unique volume.

Mgr. Knox's book should hardly, perhaps, be called a Commentary, because it is concerned only with "such difficulties as present themselves to the mind of the ordinary reader," and "stick like burs if we do not get rid of them." The book consists in fact of the footnotes that he might have wished to add to his translation of the Gospels, but could not, short of doubling the length of that work. Anything that Mgr. Knox writes is bound to be interesting, indeed, at times provocative: the very ingenuity of his mind may make him see difficulties which the ordinary reader would not notice; he would simply pass on, and regard the difficulty, if forced on his attention, as one of those intricate problems of scholarship which Mgr. Knox leaves to one side, and which, if "nineteen centuries of study" have not solved them,

are probably insoluble, or at least will have given rise to various hypothetical solutions. For our part, we could not admit the possibility that St. Matthew, writing about divorce, alluded to the *husband's* infidelity; nor that because "a man easily falls into the jargon of his day," St. John without noticing it uses "the Word," "the Life which was the Light of men" as current coin. We think that, as for "the Word" at any rate, he did use a current philosophical term but forcefully corrected it into a Christian sense whether or no anyone else had done so before him. We think that Our Lord's words spoken to His Mother at Cana in no way produced the effect in modern speech of "Don't come bothering me just now"; and sometimes we ask to be told a little more—*what* two letters, added in "a few manuscripts of Mark" to the word *adêmonein*, caused the Latin version to translate it *taedere*, which seems to us psychologically very apt in the description of Our Lord's agony in Gethsemane. Such instances are not carping, but merely show that Mgr. Knox has shirked no difficulty and has, not unexpectedly, offered here and there new and stimulating ideas, though we repeat, and fear, that the ordinary reader is not likely to study these notes with a translation open before him. We regret, however, that Mgr. Knox has, for once, offered no explanation of the silence of the Synoptists regarding the raising of Lazarus, which bulks so largely in Canon Edwards's book.

The Canon attempts a *tour de force*, and, if he seems to us to fail, this does not mean that his arguments are not often very plausible. His thesis is that in St. John's Gospel we have the very words of its originator, who lived in Pella before the sack of Jerusalem. He spoke—not wrote—while exasperated by the Jewish persecution of the "new religion," at first to non-believers in that largely pagan (though also *bien pensant*) city, but afterwards forgot about them, rather like Mgr. Knox's "absent-minded" John. He did not know the Synoptists, perhaps having independently spoken about the same time—Mark being the first to crystallize in writing the "fouled stream of tradition." These *viva voce* instructions were taken down by a stenographer, and selected from an immense pile of material and edited and published, long afterwards, by who knows whom. The thesis is extremely interesting, though unconvincing, and maybe is spoilt by speculations, e.g., that the young man who fled naked (Mark) was St. John himself. This is one of the increasing number of books which argue that St. John meant what he said, and told the truth.

C. C. MARTINDALE

A DICTATOR AT HOME

Mussolini: An Intimate Life, by Paolo Monelli (Thames and Hudson 21s).

THE ITALIAN ORIGINAL of this book is entitled *Mussolini: Piccolo Borghese* and the author is at pains to show us that the Duce was not a man of the people, as was generally believed, but belonged to the lower middle class. Signor Monelli, who in his earlier work, *Roma: 1943*, has written an account of Fascism's last year, has here attempted not a political biography but a record of its subject's private life. Indeed so sketchily are the public events which constitute its background delineated that the text has to be supplemented by historical epitomes at the head of each chapter. These, however, are not always accurate. The heading to Chapter VI represents Signor Giolitti as Prime Minister of Italy when the first world war broke out in August 1914. Actually, however, Signor Salandra had been head of the Government since the preceding March. At the end of the book are twenty pages of notes containing the author's sources of information, printed and oral. They bear witness to his indefatigability but not always to his judgment.

Mussolini was devoured by a passion for women, but this aspect of his life is dwelt on to a degree which many readers will find morbid. None of the women who enter into this narrative can be said to have exercised a decisive influence on public events and these episodes might therefore have been treated with greater brevity. However, a few weeks before his death Mussolini wrote to his wife, Rachele Guidi who bore him five children, saying that she was the only woman he had ever really loved. Though Signor Monelli does not treat of the question in systematic form he leaves us a few observations about the Dictator's religion. When he was a child we are told that while his mother and her two other children, Arnaldo and Edvige, were at Mass, Benito would stay outside saying that the smell of the candles made him feel ill, and from the top of an oak tree throw down stones at the "doctrine children" who attended the Church School.

At the time when as a deserter from military service the future Duce was living in Switzerland, he was both atheistic and blasphemous. At a public disputation, he once resorted to the often employed device of challenging God to give tangible proof of His existence by striking the challenger dead within five minutes. He spoke contemptuously of Our Lord at this time, but many years later he told Emil Ludwig that Christ was a greater man than Caesar. Like many atheists Mussolini was, we are told, superstitious. He notes in his *Autobiography* that he was born eight days after the sun had entered the constellation of Leo.

Even when Head of the Government he was afraid of the Evil Eye, and in 1924 he had his horoscope cast. But during these years he would speak sometimes as though a Christian but more often, perhaps, as a pagan. There is some evidence that Padre Tacchi-Venturi, whom the biographer speaks of as a "saintly and learned Jesuit," induced Mussolini to make his Easter Duties in 1927. For how many years this was kept up does not seem clear, but it appears that the Duce was not a practising Catholic at the time of his arrest.

However, when in the following month he was a prisoner in the Ponza Islands, before being transferred to the Gran Sasso, his thoughts seem to have turned again towards religion. He was reading and annotating Padre Ricciotti's *Vita Di Gesù Cristo*, his interest in which, as we learn from his biography of St. Paul, seems to have been not without embarrassment to the author. Mussolini asked the priest at Ponza to say a Mass for his son, Bruno, and gave him a thousand lire "to dispose of as he thought best." A few days before his death the Duce seems to have told Cardinal Schuster that when, after his arrest, he was a prisoner on the island of La Maddalena, "the local priest had persuaded him to return to the practice of religious observances and that he had been about to hear Mass on the very day he was made to leave the island." The authority for this is the Cardinal's *Gli ultimi tempi di un regime*.

The translator's rendering of foreign names is not always happy. The Belgian socialist, Emile Vandervelde is called Emilio Vandervelde. There is no reason why in an English book a Belgian should be referred to under the Italian form of his name. Pope Paul II, contrary to all usage, is referred to as Pope "Paolo" II.

HUMPHREY J. T. JOHNSON

SHORTER NOTICES

The Life of Mère Anne-Marie Javouhey, by C. C. Martindale (Longmans 8s 6d).

A SPECIAL WELCOME is due to Father Martindale's account—all too short—of Bl. Anne-Marie Javouhey, a subject admirably suited to his pen, for among the many women beatified in recent years the foundress of the Congregation of St. Joseph of Cluny is one of the most outstanding both in character and history.

The founding of a congregation of teaching sisters; the extending of their work from France to Réunion, Pondicherry and West Africa, the establishment of schools, workshops, hospitals in the Windward

Islands and Cayenne; the colonization of the Mana district of French Guiana when men had already failed badly in that undertaking; the preparation and training of hundreds of Negro slaves, men, women and children, for emancipation, in face of the opposition of French planters. These were among the achievements of this Burgundian farmer's daughter, and the difficulties to which she had to oppose her holy determination—perhaps sometimes her natural obstinacy—were not simply those inevitable to such enterprises: there were also the "schism" among the sisters in Réunion, the interdict put on Senegal, the long struggle with Bishop de Troussel d'Héricourt of Autun (involving the Ministry of Justice and Public Worship, and of Marine and the Colonies, and much else), and the two years during which the prefect apostolic of Guiana deprived Mother Javouhey of the sacraments.

The printed sources for her life are considerable: Father Martindale has distilled them into a short, eminently readable narrative with his usual skill, sympathy and critical sense. It is interesting to learn that Dom Augustine de l'Estrange, "the saviour of La Trappe," who sent the first Cistercians to North America and stirred Bl. Philippine Duchesne's desire to be a missionary there, was an important, indeed decisive, influence on Mother Javouhey in her earlier days; and that the first serious public opposition she encountered was due to her use of the system of "mutual education" named after Joseph Lancaster, the English Quaker. That was not her only English association. At the request of Sir Charles McCarthy, and with the encouragement of Bishop Poynter, she for a short time cared for the sick in Gambia and Sierra Leone; when her own ill-health forced her back to France she wept bitterly at having to leave the English colonies. Anne-Marie Javouhey was beatified in 1950, ninety-nine years after her death.

The Shakespearian Tempest, by G. Wilson Knight (Methuen 21s).

Textual Problems of the First Folio. A Study of Richard III, King Lear, Troilus and Cressida, 2 Henry IV, Hamlet, and Othello, by Alice Walker (Cambridge University Press 18s).

Elizabethan Poetry, by Hallett Smith (Harvard University Press: London, Geoffrey Cumberlege 32s 6d).

THE SHAKESPEARIAN TEMPEST, in which Professor Knight elaborates the thesis that "the basis symbols of tempest and music in vital opposition unify Shakespeare's world," is a reissue in definitive form of a volume which was originally published in 1932. The author has added a Prefatory Note of eighteen pages, which presents a chart outlining the symbolic values of Shakespeare's poetic vision. This chart was "devised to form a kind of *vade mecum* for the Shake-

spearian expert." It seems to this reviewer that Professor Knight is unduly optimistic about the acceptance of his chart, inasmuch as today most Shakespearian experts are preoccupied with textual studies, source-hunting, and the analysis of character and plot in terms of Elizabethan psychology and stage-technique—approaches to Shakespeare which he deprecates.

Textual Problems of the First Folio constitutes Volume VII in the Shakespeare Problems Series, the general editor of which is J. Dover Wilson. Miss Walker argues that the Folio texts of the six plays which she examines in detail were set from quartos corrected by collation with playhouse manuscripts. The problems which she attempts to solve bear on textual errors of omission and commission—the errors which were overlooked by the collator as well as those which were perpetrated by the compositors. Her highly specialized work should prove of service to future editors of the six plays under consideration.

Professor Smith's *Elizabethan Poetry* is a competent and readable survey of the conventions, the meaning and the expression of English verse as written during the last quarter of the sixteenth century. Proceeding by genre rather than by chronology, he discusses in turn the pastoral, Ovidian poetry, the sonnet, satire, the song, and the heroic poem. The chapters on Ovidian verse and the sonnet are notable for their fresh and perceptive treatment of Shakespeare's two narrative poems and his sonnets.

Aspects of Buddhism, by Henri de Lubac. Translated by George Lamb (Sheed and Ward 12s 6d).

IT IS INCREASINGLY CLEAR that the philosophies of the East should be studied seriously. The days are, we hope, past when facile comparisons allowed men to talk of Buddhist infiltrations into Christianity and the history of Our Lord in particular. If there was any give-and-take, it may have been (as Fr. de Lubac points out) between the East and Alexandrian Gnosticism. Far more subtle and penetrating is an investigation into the alleged similarity between Buddhist and Christian "charity." We must affirm that Buddhist compassion or pity is a deviation from the genuine ideal of serenity which excludes all affection of any sort. We cannot but think that the Buddhist, or even earlier forms of, Nirvana, is a negation (it certainly does away with all individuality) and has to be expressed wholly in interest, though of less real importance. Thus the history of the Tree in Buddhism (which, like Christianity, began by being aniconic) can well be compared with the treatment of the Cross by earlier Christian symbolists. Today, we are so stupefied by the materialism that we

inbreathe despite ourselves, that it never occurs to us that a thing can mean, spiritually, more than it looks like, though even physical science has taught us that nothing *is* what it looks like. Finally, Fr. de Lubac touches on what theologians maybe still need to probe—*how* the Son of God is to “recapitulate” *all* things into Himself—thus, not only men, but the world of pure spirits, and of matter. Buddha’s self-manifestations would lead us to Docetism, and the “World-Illusion.” This learned book directs us to a field which may prove most valuably fertile.

The Shepherds of Fatima, by Fr. De Marchi. Retold by Elisabeth Cobb (Sheed and Ward 7s 6d).

Mary in the Documents of the Church, by P. F. Palmer, S.J. (Burns and Oates 9s 6d).

FR. DE MARCHI, who wrote the classic book on Fatima, has now written an account of the apparitions there for children. We cannot tell whether it is he, or his American adapter, who has altered the story in many details; but possibly this will not matter for the children to whom it is recommended that the book be read. To our feeling, the translation talks down to the little readers, and at times is even jocose. Perhaps something still simpler would have suited better. The illustrations, by Jeanyee Wong, are stylized and not ineffective, though we think that the actual description of Our Lady’s dress, and her method of displaying her Heart, should have been adhered to.

Fr. Palmer tells us that for some years he had been preparing a series of volumes illustrating the basic dogmas of our Faith by means of documents, thus showing their historical development. While arranging a volume to be called *Mary, the Second Eve*, the dogma of the Assumption was defined. He judged it therefore opportune to publish the present volume as a “completely separate work.” The excerpts he provides are by no means only those which were sure to be quoted, but many that come from the East, notably St. Ephrem’s splendid hymn: in fact, so rich is the oriental legacy (because Christological heresies arose in the East, with the result that Our Lady’s prerogatives were examined and stressed sooner and more fully than in the West) that the recent definitions of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption caused little stir there—in fact, it may be that by way of Mary a closer understanding shall come to pass between oriental and western theologians. Theological comment, says the author, has been kept to a minimum: the texts are allowed to speak for themselves. The book should be specially helpful when discussing Marian doctrine with such non-Catholics as retain a belief in the divinity of Our Lord.

Introduction to the Devout Life, translated and edited by Mgr. J. K. Ryan (Longmans 7s 6d).

The Spirit of St. François de Sales, edited and newly translated by C. F. Kelley (Longmans 8s 6d).

Meditations and Devotions, by J. H. Newman (Longmans 7s 6d).

MR. RYAN'S EXCELLENT TRANSLATION of this ever-better known book is from the authentic French text established by Dom B. Mackey, with due regard to earlier translations. In a wonderfully brief yet satisfying introduction Mgr. Ryan traces the history of the book, shows the saint's own view of it, and sympathetically indicates why the book has lost none of its attractiveness but appeals, as St. Francis meant it to do, to the most various classes of readers. His asceticism is flexible, yet firm; his style, graceful and never florid. Mr. Kelley's *Spirit of St. François de Sales* has been edited to make manageable the six-volume work of St. Francis's great friend, Jean-Pierre Camus, bishop of Belley. Repetitions have been harmlessly excised; order has been introduced, without artificiality, into what was diffuse: Mr. Aldous Huxley is quoted as saying that in these pages the saint "comes to life," and so does the exuberant bishop himself, about whom Mr. Kelley writes a quite admirable introduction. Naturally Camus can tell us all sorts of details about his worshipped friend that St. Francis would never have mentioned about himself: and it is these, precisely, that vitalize the whole book and take it out of the ruck of the older hagiography.

Newman considered that he could "meditate best with a pen in his hand." And perhaps he never wrote purely for his own sake; Fr. Tristram, in his sensitive and balanced preface, shows that these "jottings," here too, were put together for the sake of others, and maybe for that reason Newman remains in a sober world, a lowly atmosphere. But that is not all! His simplicity is transparent, and through it you descry those two "realities" which from the outset were luminous to him—God, and his own soul. This book may show to us a Newman less familiar, but more precious, than the controversialist or writer of perfect sermons.

The Priest, by Beatrix Beck; translated by Constantine FitzGibbon (Michael Joseph 10s 6d).

THIS BOOK won the Prix Goncourt, and Mme Beck is the second woman to win it. The scene is France during the occupation: the story is that of a young woman widowed of her Jewish husband in the war, and having to hide her child from the Occupants. At first we could not see why the book won the Prize, and we wished that no

more books about war-horrors should be written. But we need, maybe, when reflecting on France, to realize the ghastly conditions to which even the provinces were reduced, conditions wholly without parallel in England, and to understand therefore the generation in which priests had to work—and, psychologically, still must work. The abbé Morin is not a priest-worker, though just as unconventional: but it is not he who impresses us so tragically as the degradation of what cannot possibly be called “his flock”; certainly these starved, erotic, blasphemous yet spasmodically generous lay-folk are all too real. The advent of the Americans does but unloose, at first, a worse hysteria and vengefulness. We noticed but few slips in the translation: perhaps even an expert cannot realize that *vicaires* are curates, not vicars; *praemium* does not mean “conquest”; this simple parish priest would not have been “violet-clad”: there is no “Elevation of the Host” at Benediction.

W. B. Yeats' Letters to Katherine Tynan, edited by Roger McHugh (Clonmore and Reynolds 18s).

Divided Image, by Margaret Rudd (Routledge and Kegan Paul 18s).

W. B. YEATS MET KATHERINE TYNAN in 1885 when he was twenty and she was twenty-four. The friendship matured, and when Yeats moved to London shortly afterwards Katherine Tynan became his main personal contact with Ireland. Their correspondence continued until 1892, and these published letters are of value in that they cover a formative period in Yeats's literary life. They also emphasize Yeats's belief that there is no great literature without nationality, and vice versa.

Mysticism, however, is beyond nationalism, and this may partly explain why the divided Yeats never attained to a supernatural vision and failed to follow in the footsteps of his master, William Blake. In *Divided Image*, Margaret Rudd sets out to examine the vision, mystical vision, that Yeats hoped to achieve, and she relates magician to saint, poet to mystic, and the poet's romantic love or eros to the Christian agape. The affinities between Yeats and Blake are largely taken for granted, and the argument proceeds from there. But can these affinities validly be claimed?

Widely differing types of men may claim affinities with Blake. D. H. Lawrence, for instance, was basically opposed by nature to Yeats, yet both, with Blake, were extraordinarily sensitive to what Wordsworth called “unknown modes of being,” while all three shared the power of distinguishing their own feelings and emotions from conventional sentiment (though this is probably true of any major artist). It was, as John Eglington has pointed out, during the period in

which Yeats edited Blake's works that he wrote most of the poems which have determined his place. But his later belief in poetry as a form of magic could have been little derived from Blake, who identified his own work with prophecy. Unlike Blake, Yeats was an extremely self-conscious artist. There was also lacking in him, or at least in the movement which he led, the moral seriousness which characterized Blake.

Yeats's ambition in mysticism was the discovery of esoteric symbols, and there was no path out of the Celtic Twilight into Jerusalem.

Héloïse and Abélard, by Étienne Gilson (Hollis and Carter 16s.).

THE MINUTE ATTENTION given by M. Gilson to this enigmatic story—he does not claim to have provided its definitive solution—is justified if only because it displays the amazing states of mind possible, if not prevalent, in the twelfth century. Both the lovers were dominated by the conviction that marriage was incompatible with a man's pursuit of philosophy or public career as Teacher. So, St. Jerome, in the train of Seneca, Cicero and Theophrastus. Abélard wanted to marry Héloïse, which though a cleric and a Canon he could do, and though concubinage was widely regarded as a not-dishonourable non-sacramental wedlock; *but*, the marriage must be kept secret for the sake of his career. Héloïse, sure that a marriage could not be kept secret, fought hard against it. But, completely "at his orders," she first married him, and then, without the least vocation, became a nun, prioress, and abbess. He on his side seems to have been sincerely "converted" and became a monk. The book does not deal with any other part of his career. It accepts, too, the authenticity of the Abélard-Héloïse correspondence, or at least vivaciously rebuts arguments against it.

Christianity, Diplomacy and War, by Herbert Butterfield (The Epworth Press 8s 6d).

PROFESSOR BUTTERFIELD brings to this task both historical erudition and sincere attachment to Christian principles. He holds that a Christian should in time of war be diffident in supposing that all wickedness is on the side of the enemy and that the fate of God Himself depends on his own side being victorious. War, the author believes, can decide nothing in fact but a redistribution of power. In the twentieth century we have returned to the notion of war waged with an unlimited objective, as were the "wars of religion" in the sixteenth century, when each side aimed at total victory and the extirpation of

the opponents' creed. Between the sixteenth century and our own day lies the eighteenth when wars were fought with only limited objectives in view. Professor Butterfield admires the European system as it existed at this epoch when small States enjoyed freedom of movement and were not condemned to the role of satellites. To wage a "messianic" war, that is to say war for the purpose of creating a Utopia, it is necessary to turn on the "atrocious tap" and instil into the masses feelings of hatred towards the enemy. But even this may defeat itself. For suppose that a situation arises in which a statesman feels that prudence requires that he should contract out of a war, he may be prevented from doing this owing to the inflamed state of public opinion which he has had a share in creating.

The Hive, by C. J. Cela: Introduction by A. Barea (Gollancz 12s 6d).

IT MAY indicate Sr. Barea's sincerity, that he, an anti-Franco-ist, should write an account of Cela's work and an introduction to this book in particular, since the author fought for Franco and in fact joined the Falangists. He also endeavours to explain Cela's "bold and dogmatic assertion" that "I think that today novels can be written—well or badly—only in the way I do it." His method seems to be the juxtaposition of disconnected paragraphs, so that the book has neither beginning nor development nor finality, but can be called a "slice of Life," in this case, of Madrid-life. We are also led to suppose that in the mountains or low-lying villages are to be found courage, beauty and even gaiety. But here the author has chosen to provide, not a "slice" of city-life so much as a patchwork of the coarseness, no doubt, but above all of the vulgarity and stupidity that can exist in any city. True, the book is "dated" in 1943, and, as usual, hunger is one dominant note in its cacophony, but also, "greed, fear, frustration, desire, malice, snobbery, poverty, nausea and fumbling tenderness," all "without charity and quite without reticence." If the reader's mind is left full of an "unclean bitterness," it is, too, aroused to "an overwhelming, cleansing pity." Pity, perhaps; but not "cleansing," and far less coherent than Zola's wearisome theses were. Sr. Cela has done nothing but disservice to his country by writing this book, since the examination of one putrid patch on one melon risks making people fancy that the whole fruit has gone bad.

ONE of the great occupational risks of business life under the pressure of to-day is that the practical man of affairs neglects his outside reading, and all too easily falls into a narrow circle of immediate preoccupations. There is always loss in this, and the Catholic business or professional man, as a member of the Church Universal, has a particularly strong reason for keeping his mind open to wider horizons. Certainly it was never more necessary than now to follow world happenings. A direct chain of causes and effects ties every business to economical changes in the world, which are themselves as often the consequence as the cause of changes in men's political and social ideas. These ideas in their turn come out of the religions, or irreligions, of contemporary man.

In many countries the Catholic Church is at the heart of the battle of ideas. Cardinal Manning's saying that "all great quarrels between men are at bottom theological" suggests that there is, in fact, no better starting-point or background for understanding the modern world than a Catholic one. Because of this approach and background,

THE TABLET

is a weekly review unlike any other in this country, and more and more discerning readers find its value to them year by year. THE TABLET is obtainable from any news-agent, price 9d. weekly, or direct by post from The Publisher, 128 Sloane Street, London, S.W.1, price 42s. per annum, post free. Send a postcard for a specimen copy.

COLDS?

Nothing acts faster than
ANADIN *and it's SAFE!*

WHY 'ANADIN' GIVES FAST RELIEF

There are four reasons for the speed with which 'Anadin' tackles a cold. Aspirin, phenacetin and quinine act together to relieve discomfort and bring down temperature, while caffeine eliminates the depressing after-effects so often experienced after the use of old-fashioned remedies.

Tens of thousands of professional people who deal daily with the problem of pain know and use 'Anadin', and know 'Anadin', the fast and safe pain killer, is absolutely suitable for ordinary people.

HEADACHE

The 'Anadin' formula is a fast worker and any chemist will tell you why the relief lasts longer, without the risk of those unpleasant after-effects you used to have.

NEURALGIA

Don't suffer the stab and ache of neuralgia or any nerve pains. 'Anadin' brings fast relief without the risk of any unpleasant after-effects.

'ANADIN' Tablets . . . from chemists everywhere 20 for 1/9d. and 50 for 3/6d.



Ready-to-Wear
Show of coats and suits
begins February 8th

Jacqmar Retail shop

16 GROSVENOR STREET LONDON WJ Tel. Mayfair 6111